A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Brief HISTORY

OF THE

UNITARIANS,

Against

Dr. SHERLOCK'S ANSWER

IN HIS

VINDICATION

OF THE

Holy Trinity.

Peter Allix? DNB 41:282

LONDON:

Printed in the Year, M.DC.XCI.

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Bis HISTORY

OF THE

UNITARIANS,

Against

Dr. Sherlock's ANSWER

IN HIS

VINDICATION

OF THE

Holy Trinity.

LONDON.

Printed in the Year, M.DC.XCI.

OBSERVATIONS On Dr. SHERLOCK'S ANSWER TO THE Brief HISTORY OF THE UNITARIANS.

CHAP. I.

Containing some General Observations.

WHen I see Men arguing against the Trinity; methinks I hear a Papist inveighing against *Luther* or *Calvin*, for questioning the Truth of Transubstantiation. Indeed it appears to me very strange, that Protestants should stand to *the Principles of the Reformation*, only when they serve their turn; and that they should be ready to part with them, when they are not otherways able to defend a particular Opinion. It cannot be denied, that the Christian Church in succeeding Ages fell short of her first Purity, in respect of Doctrine as well as Manners. Now what other Remedy could be applied to such a Depravation, than a sincere and careful Examination of the Points suspected of Falshood, according to Reason and Scripture? This proved so effectual a Course; that Transubstantiation, and some other Canonized Opinions were found to be meer Human Inventions, and accordingly were rejected as contrary to the two above-mentioned Rules. And who can assure us, that the Reformation left no Error behind; and that the Trinity is such an Opinion, as ought neither to be doubted of, nor to be reformed? Shall we trust Men, barely on their Word? Or was it impossible that the Trinity should creep into the Church, as well as several other false Opinions? Our Principles therefore allow us to examine it; and so inquire, whether it be founded on undeniable Arguments: especially being of such a nature that it contradicts Reason; and by confession of all Trinitarians, is no where set down in Holy Scripture *in express Words*. Why should Men call us Hereticks and Libertines, because we inquire after Truth; and will have our Faith built upon a solid Foundation? Was the Reformation so proper to *Luther* and *Calvin*, *&c.* that it ought no more to be thought of? Or were those Reformers so infallible, that they purged the Church from all Errors? This I think would be an hard matter to prove. Let therefore no Protestant be scandalized; if having some Scruples about the Trinity, we endeavour to free our selves from them, by a sincere inquiry into the Grounds of it.

I begin with *Reaſon*; and find that the belief of a Trinity does contradict it, as much as Tranſubſtantiation. According to Tranſubſtantiation, the ſame Numerical Body may be in a Million of different places at the ſame time. According to the Trinity, three Divine Perſons, that is to ſay, three Intelligent Infinite Beings, each of which is God, make but one God. I cannot believe the Firſt; becauſe Reaſon teaches me, that one Numerical Body can occupy or be in but one place at one time. I cannot believe the other; becauſe Reaſon tells me, that Three are Three, and not One: and that it implies no leſs a Contradiction, that Three Divine Perſons ſhould be but One God; than that one Body be a Million. Now who ſhould not ſcruple an Opinion, perfectly parallel with Tranſubſtantiation; and equally fruitful in Incongruities and Contradictions?

I come in the ſecond place to examine; Whether the Trinity be well grounded *in Scripture?* Indeed *Three* are there mentioned; *the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt:* but how came Men to fancy, that they Three are but One God? Who taught 'em ſo? Does the Holy Scripture plainly ſay; that *there is but one God, yet there are Three Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the Godhead?* One would think indeed, that ſuch a Myſtery, and ſo neceſſary in order to Salvation, were ſet down in Scripture in plain or expreſs Words. But the Scripture is perfectly ſilent about it: there is not a Word to be found in the Bible, of *Three Hypoſtaſes or Perſons in the Godhead.* The Father is in a thouſand places called *God*, diſtinctly from the Son; nay *the only true God.* The Holy Ghoſt is no where ſtiled *God.* And the Son is ſo called in a few places, as it were by the way, and in ſuch manner as plainly ſhows, that the Title [*God*] is beſtowed on him, upon the ſame account as upon *Moſes*, even becauſe of the Dignity and Power, to which he was exalted by the Father's Liberality. Indeed it can have no other meaning. The Holy Scripture teaches us, that there is but one God, the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. But if ſo; How can the Son be that one God, the Father? Of this we are ſure, by the whole tenor of the Goſpel, that Chriſt was a Man. The Goſpel is nothing elſe but the Hiſtory of Chriſt's Birth, Life, Death, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion into Heaven. Who would have thought, that a Man ſhould be accounted the Supream God, without any ſuch intimation from Scripture, nay againſt the whole current of it? We find in the Goſpel, that there is one God, the Father of our Lord Chriſt; one Son of God, ſent into the World to be the Revealer of his Father's Will, and a Mediator between God and Man, even Chriſt; and one Holy Ghoſt, who diſtributes and works all ſorts of Miraculous Gifts, for the confirmation of the Goſpel. The Father of Chriſt is the One true God; Chriſt is only his Miniſter and Interpreter; the Holy Ghoſt (whether it be God's Power, or his miniſtring Angel, or Angels) the Inſtrument which he makes uſe of to work Miracles. None certainly but Men blinded or prejudiced could think, that God's Miniſter and Ambaſſador were God himſelf; and that two ſo oppoſite Beings as God and Chriſt, ſhould be one and the ſame Thing. It is juſt as if one ſhould ſay, there is one King *William*; and one Vice-Roy in *Ireland*, the Lord *Sidney*; and the Vice-Roy is that one King *William.* Indeed this is a Doctrine ſo unreaſonable and contradictious, and ſo oppoſite to Holy Scripture; that I think, had there been no ſuch thing as Platonick Philoſophy, the Trinity ſhould never have been heard of. I deſire therefore the *Trinitarians*, to abate a little of their Confidence: Let them examine with an unprejudiced Mind, upon what Foundations they build the belief of a Trinity; and they will ſoon perceive how weak and frail it is. Let them at laſt confeſs, that the Scripture does not threaten eternal Damnation to thoſe who disbelieve a Trinity: And then, if themſelves won't part with their darling Opinion; let them abſtain from perſecuting others.

Thirdly. Trinitarians lay ſo much ſtreſs upon *the Tradition of the Church* concerning the Trinity, that I think it worth while to undeceive

undeceive them; by ſhewing, that there never was ſo great a Variation in the Church, as about this Point. I ſhall divide into three Periods all the Ages of the Church. The Firſt reaches to the Council of *Nice*: The Second from the Council of *Nice*, to the Schoolmen: And the Third from the Schoolmen, to our time.

And one that is never ſo little acquainted with the Writings of the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries, cannot deny, if he be but ſincere; that thoſe Fathers follow the *Ideas* of *Plato* concerning the three Principles, and therefore ſpeak rather like *Arians* than *Orthodox*. They tell us, that the Son and Holy Ghoſt have each of them his own Nature and Eſſence, whereby they are diſtinguiſh'd from each other; and that the Son is ſubordinate and inferior to the Father, both in Nature and Power; as likewiſe the Holy Ghoſt is ſubordinate to the Son. If any one deſires to ſee ſome undeniable Proofs of what I aſſert, I refer him to the *Quaternio* of *Curcellæus*, whereby he will be fully ſatisfied.

The ſucceeding Fathers finding fault with this Notion, brought into the World a new Interpretation of the three Principles. They won't have them to be ſubordinate, but equal both in Nature and Power. However they acknowledg them to be three Eſſences, or Collateral Beings. If you ask them, how they can avoid admitting a Plurality of Gods? They will anſwer, That thoſe three Beings are but one God, as *Peter*, *James* and *John*, are but one Man. If you deny that *Peter*, *James* and *John*, are but one Man; they will tell you, that you are miſtaken; becauſe in Propriety of Speech, this term *Man* ought not to ſignify an Individual, as *Peter*, or *James*, or *John*; but a ſpecifical Nature common to them all; ſo that tho they be three Individuals, or three Perſons; yet they are but one Man, being Partakers of the ſame ſpecifical common Nature. This they apply to their three Principles: They are indeed (ſay they) three Hypoſtaſes or Perſons, yet they are but one God: This term *God* denoting not an Individual Hypoſtaſis, but a Nature common to the three Perſons of the Trinity, whereby tho they are three, yet they are ſaid to be but one God. Thus they made ſhift, as well as they could. It was indeed a very unſufficient way of explaining the Unity of God, and did by no means reſolve the difficulty. They made an abſtract ſpecifical God, (*as the Heathens might equally have done*) but there were ſtill three Individual or Numerical Gods; as *Peter*, *James* and *John*, may be ſaid to be by Abſtraction one ſpecifical Man, becauſe they have the ſame ſpecifical Nature; but however they are ſtill three Individual Numerical Men.

Therefore the Schoolmen diſliking this Notion, as favouring Polytheiſm, found out a new one more agreeable (as they thought) to the Unity of God. They won't have the three Perſons of the Trinity to have each of them his own Eſſence and Nature. No, this too plainly deſtroys the Unity of God. There is, ſay they, but one Divine Eſſence. Right! but then they muſt not part with three Perſons of the Trinity: Therefore, what are thoſe three Perſons? They are Three Subſiſtences; Three Modes; Three Relations; Three I know not whats. This is meer Nonſenſe: for a Perſon is an Intelligent Being, and Three Perſons muſt needs be Three Intelligent Beings. So true it is, that whoſoever acknowledges Three Perſons in the Godhead (if he takes the Word in its proper ſenſe) muſt admit Three Gods: Which the Learned Doctor cannot avoid, who ſays they are *Three diſtinct Minds*, *Three ſubſtantial Beings*, *Three intelligent Beings*; therefore unavoidably Three Gods.

Now is it fair to boaſt ſo much of the Tradition concerning the Trinity, as if it had been conſtant and unalterable in all the Ages of the Church, when the contrary appears to any ſincere Reader? The Fathers who lived before the Council of *Nice*, ſpeak, like *Platonic Philoſophers* and *Arians*; the Nicene Fathers like *Tritheiſts*; and the Schoolmen like *Mad-men*. Where

now..

now is that unchangeable Tradition, so much cried up? Considering the ridiculousness of those Men, who in their respective Ages set up new Notions of the Trinity; I am apt to say, contrary to *Averroes* his Wish, *Let not my Soul be with the Philosophers.* To conclude this Chapter, those great Boasters of the (pretended) Tradition, should do well to apply themselves to the confuting the *Sexterno* of *Cuvellæus* before mentioned; which when they have fully and truly performed, we may perhaps begin to think of parting with Tradition, which indeed is not the Foundation whereon we build our Faith, *Knowing* only *the Scriptures which are able to make wise unto Salvation.*

CHAP. II.

Containing an Examination of the Doctor's Answers, to the Arguments against the Trinity in the History of the Unitarians.

HAving premised this general Observation; I come to examine, what Answer the Doctor returns to the Arguments alledged against the Trinity, by the Author of *the Brief History of the Unitarians.*

But I must first consider his Reflections, concerning the use of Reason in expounding Scripture. 'This is (saith he) an Impudent Argument, which brings Revelation 'down in such sublime Mysteries to the 'level of our Understandings, to say, such a 'Doctrine cannot be contained in Scripture, 'because it implies a Contradiction; whereas a modest Man would first inquire, whether it be in Scripture or not; and if it be 'plainly contained there, he would conclude, 'how *Unintelligible* soever it appeared to 'him, that yet there is no Contradiction in 'it, because it is taught in Scripture. p. 141.

But is this Impudence, to say, Transubstantiation cannot be contained in Scripture, because it implies a Contradiction? I hope not. Well then, if the Trinity implies no less Contradiction than Transubstantiation; why can't we say, that it cannot be contained in Scripture? We say, Transubstantiation cannot be found in Scripture, because it is a plain Contradiction to our Reason; but if the Trinity be also a plain Contradiction to our Reason; why shan't we be allowed to say, that it cannot be contained in Scripture? I think both Consequences are right. But saith the Author, *A modest Man would first inquire whether it be in Scripture or not?* But we have already made such an Inquiry, and cannot find the Trinity in Scripture. We never could read there, that *there are Three Persons in one Numerical God.* Indeed, how could we? We might as well find there, that *the Bread of the Sacrament is Transubstantiated into Christ's Body.* But he goes on; 'And if it be plainly contained there, he 'should conclude, *how Unintelligible* soever 'it appeared to him, that yet there is no 'Contradiction in it, because it is taught in 'Scripture. I beg the Author's pardon; there is a vast difference, between *Unintelligible* and *Contradictious.* He should not have said, How Unintelligible soever, but how Contradictious soever: And thus his Words ought to run; 'He should conclude, how '*Contradictious soever* it appeared to him, 'that yet there is *no Contradiction* in it, be-'cause it is taught by Scripture.

I perceive, the Author found it too harsh to say that, how Contradictious soever a thing appears to be, that yet there is no Contradiction in it, because it is taught by Scripture;

Scripture; and therefore he puts the word *Unintelligible*, instead of the word *Contradictious*. In effect, we do not say, that every Unintelligible Thing contained in Scripture, is a Contradiction. We acknowledg, the Resurrection plainly set down in Scripture, does imply no Contradiction, how Unintelligible soever it be; because we do very clearly conceive, that God is able to raise our dead Bodies. We don't apprehend the manner of this Resurrection; how it shall be performed, is a thing Unintelligible to us; but however 'tis altogether free from a Contradiction. Were the Trinity as clearly set down in Scripture, and as free from Contradiction; we would not disbelieve it, how Unintelligible soever it appeared to us, no more than we disbelieve the Resurrection. But the Trinity being not only Unintelligible, but Contradictious; we deny it is taught in Scripture, which is altogether free from Contradiction.

Let us hear the Author a little further; 'We must not indeed (saith he) expound 'Scripture contrary to common Sense, and 'to the common Reason of Mankind, in 'such Matters as every Man knows, and e-'very Man can judge of; but in Matters of 'pure Revelation, which we have no na-'tural Idea of, and know nothing of them 'but what is revealed; we must not pre-'tend some imaginary Contradictions, to 'reject *the plain and express* Authority of Re-'velation. For 'tis impossible to know, 'what is a Contradiction to the Nature of 'Things, whose Natures we do not under-'stand. *We must not indeed expound Scripture, contrary to common Sense, and the common Reason of Mankind, in such Matters as every Man knows and every Man can judge of.* I grant it; but what if the Trinity doth contradict *the common Reason of Mankind*; and is of such a Na-ture *as every Man knows, and every Man can judge of?* Then certainly it cannot be contained in Scripture, according to this Author himself. Indeed we cannot fathom the Essence of an infinite Being, no more than (as this Author saith) the Essence of any created Being; yet as we have a distinct knowledg of some Properties of a Finite Being, so we have a clear Apprehension of the Attributes of God. We cannot be mistaken in the Notion of *One* and *Three*; we are most certain, that One is not Three, and that Three are not One. The most simple Men have a clear Apprehension of those two Numbers, and therefore are able to judge of them. Now the Scripture plainly tells us, that there is but One God; and every one knows that *One God is One Intelligent Infinite Person*, and therefore cannot be Three such Persons. He that has an Idea of *One*, and an Idea of *Three*, must needs perceive that it implies a Contradiction, that One be Three, and Three One; that one God be Three Intelligent Infinite Persons or Beings, and Three Intelligent Infinite Beings One God; This every one can judge of. *Therefore we must not expound Scripture* (saith the Author) *contrary to common Sense, and the common Reason of Mankind; in such Matters as every Man knows, and every Man can judge of:* Therefore (say I) all being capable of judging, whether *One* may be *Three*, and *Three One*; and finding it a plain Contradiction to the common Reason of Mankind; all may be assured, that it cannot be contained in Scripture.

'But (saith the Author) in Matters of 'pure Revelation, which we have no na-'tural Idea of, and know nothing of 'em 'but what is revealed; we must not pre-'tend some imaginary Contradictions, to 'reject *the plain and express* Authority of 'Scripture and Revelation; for it is im-'possible to know, what is a Contradiction 'to the Natures of Things, whose Natures 'we do not understand. Now what does the Author mean by *the plain and express* Authority of Revelation? Does he mean, that he has found somewhere in Scripture in *plain and express* Words, that *there are Three Persons in one Divine Nature or Godhead?* If it be so, let him shew us it. I doubt he calls *plain and express Authority*, some false *Consequences*, which he is pleased to draw from Scripture,

Scripture, and which none but prejudiced Men would ever think of.

I wiſh we could ſhew a *Chineſe*, the Goſpel well tranſlated into his own Language; and ask him, after a ſerious reading of it, what he thought Chriſt to be? It is very likely, I think, that he would not take him to be the ſupream God; and if any Man ſhould tell him, he had overſeen ſo great a Myſtery; he would undoubtedly anſwer, that he is ſure there is no ſuch thing in the Goſpel which he read, unleſs there be another Goſpel wherein ſuch a Notion is contained. I confeſs there are ſome Matters of Revelation, which we have no natural Idea of; and know nothing of them but what is revealed; ſuch is the Reſurrection of the Dead: But then thoſe Matters imply no Contradiction, and therefore ought not to be rejected. This firſt (the Reſurrection) may be diſcovered to us by the Light of Revelation; and diſcovering no Contradiction in it, we ought to believe it. The ſecond (the Trinity) claſhing altogether with our natural Ideas, can be no Matter of Revelation, and therefore ought not to be believed. The Reſurrection is ſuch a Thing, as we could never have diſcovered by the Light of Nature; yet as ſoon as we come to know it, we aſſent to it, becauſe we clearly perceive the Poſſibility thereof, and are ſure it implies no Contradiction at all: but it is not ſo with the Trinity; ſuch a Myſtery can never be revealed to us, becauſe Revelation cannot be contrary to Reaſon; and therefore the Trinity being contrary to this, cannot be the Matter of that. God indeed may reveal to us ſuch Objects, as are unknown to Humane Reaſon; but let them be never ſo much above our Reaſon, they will never contradict it. *It is impoſſible to know, what is a Contradiction to the Nature of Things, whoſe Natures we do not underſtand.* Right! But we know ſo much of the Nature of God, that He is One, and not Three; and this is ſufficient to ſhow that the Trinity is a Contradiction to the Nature of God.

What I ſay, is ſo clear and ſo notorious a Truth, that the Author himſelf is forced to acknowledg it; He ſaith, *p.* 147. 'We muſt 'not expound Scripture to ſuch a Senſe, 'as contradicts the plain and expreſs Maxims 'of natural Reaſon: For though God reveals 'ſuch Things to us, as natural Reaſon could 'not diſcover, and cannot comprehend; yet '*Revelation cannot contradict plain Reaſon*; for 'Truth cannot contradict it ſelf; what is 'true in Revelation, can never be falſe in 'Reaſon; and what is true by natural Rea'ſon, can never be falſe in Revelation. All this he grants, only he ſaith, that we muſt be ſure there is ſuch a Contradiction; it muſt be evident and expreſs, and not made out by uncertain Conſequences, which many times are not owing to the Nature of Things, but to the Imperfection of our own Knowledge. This I grant too; But the Author won't allow the Trinity to be ſuch a Contradiction; and endeavours to prove it: Let us hear him.

He ſoon perceives the difficulty, and therefore brings it in by way of an Objection. 'Yes, you'l ſay, that there ſhould be Three 'Perſons, each of which is God, and yet 'but One God, is a Contradiction. But 'what Principle of natural Reaſon does it 'contradict? Reaſon tells us, that Three 'Gods cannot be One God; but does Rea'ſon tell us, that Three Divine Perſons can'not be One God? If my Reaſon be like 'other Mens, I am ſure my Reaſon ſays no'thing at all about it, does neither affirm 'nor deny it.

Is not this an admirable Argument, which conſiſts only in an Interrogation, and in a meer denial of the difficulty propoſed in the Objection? *What Principle of natural Reaſon does it contradict? Does Reaſon tell us, that Three Divine Perſons cannot be one God?* Here is the Interrogation or Query. To which I anſwer; Yes, it does contradict a plain Principle of natural Reaſon, even this, that Three cannot be One. *If my Reaſon be like other Mens, I am ſure my Reaſon ſays nothing at all about it, doth neither affirm nor deny it.* Here

is

is a meer denial of the difficulty: I judge the Author's Reason must needs be very weak and corrupted, seeing it likes well this falshood, that Three are One; and finds no fault with it. Those unquestionably have a better sight, and a more sound Reason, who discern, it implies a Contradiction, that Three be but One; because they perceive and acknowledg that *Three is three times One*, and therefore cannot be only *once One*.

'Well (saith the Doctor, pleading for his 'Adversaries) if we believe Three distinct 'Divine Persons, each of which is God, we 'must believe Three distinct Gods. *I hope* 'not, when we profess to believe but One 'God: Yes, whatever we profess to believe, 'Three such distinct Persons must be Three 'Gods. Now *this we deny*, and *challenge them* 'to produce any plain Principle of Reason 'to prove that it must be so. Natural Rea'son teaches Nothing about the Personality 'of the Godhead: it teaches One God, but 'whether this One God be One or Three 'Persons, it says not, and therefore He may 'be either, without contradicting the na'tural Notions we have of One God; and 'then there is free scope for Revelation; and 'if Revelation teaches there is but One God, 'and that there are Three Divine Persons, 'each of which hath (in Scripture) not 'only the Title, but the Nature and At'tributes of God ascribed to him, then we 'must of necessity believe a Trinity in U'nity, Three Persons and one God. For 'what the Scripture affirms, and Reason 'does not deny, is a proper Object of our 'Faith; and then this Objection against this 'Faith, that Three distinct Divine Persons 'must be Three distinct Gods, if each of 'them be God, is senseless and ridiculous.

I have transcribed this whole Paragraph, because it deserves some particular Reflection. 1. I observe, that it contains no positive Proofs, but a meer denial. The Author is extreamly confident and bold; and yet all his reasonings may be resolved into *I hope not*, and *this we deny*. Indeed this is a very short way of answering Objections; and as easy as to *burn Books that are unanswerable*. There lies an Objection cross in his way, that if we believe Three distinct Divine Persons, we must believe Three distinct Gods. To this he answers, I hope not, when we profess to believe but one God. Is this a direct Confutation? must we be satisfied with such an Answer: because Trinitarians profess that Three Divine Persons are but one God; does it follow, that it is true, and cannot be doubted of? He *hopes not*, and he *denies it*, therein lies the strength of his Argument and Answer. 2. I should have added, *he challenges*; for this is his third way of confuting Objections. He challenges us to produce any plain Principle of Reason, to prove that Three distinct Divine Persons must be Three Gods. But we have a plain Principle of Reason at hand, to answer his Challenge, to wit, that it implies a Contradiction that Three be but One. 3. Here is a most absurd and ridiculous Paradox, as I ever heard of; *Natural Reason teaches nothing about the Personality of God or the Godhead; it teaches One God; but whether this One God be One or Three Persons, it says not.* What? If Reason tells us that *there is One God*; He must be One Intelligent Being. Now according to Reason we have no other Idea of Unity, but such as we have of a Man, a Beast, and a Tree. Therefore as Reason teaches that a Man is one Person, because he is one Intelligent Being; so it follows that according to Human Reason, God is but one Person, being but one Intelligent Being. Reason does not tell us that the Unity of God is different from the Unity of a Man: it produces in our Minds the same Idea of both; which being applied to God as well as to Man, must needs denote One Person or Intelligent Being in opposition to Two or Three. Nay, if Reason teaches nothing about the Personality of the Godhead (which the Author does not think fit to prove) *what Idea can we have of the Unity of God by Reason?* As long as we are ignorant, whether God be one or three Persons; our Idea of him must needs be more imperfect than of any other Being, in that very Notion which is so familiar to us, and which God himself has so much

urged, *viz.* his Unity. This is ſo falſe a Principle, and ſo contrary to the Dictates of Reaſon, that there never was any Man, *taught by Reaſon* that there is but one God, but did believe at the ſame time, that He is but one Perſon. The Author ſhould not have ventur'd abroad ſuch a Philoſophy, contrary to the Reaſon of all Mankind; but ought to have kept it for himſelf. Now I find that the Scripture doth perfectly agree with Reaſon. This tells me that there is but one God, who is but one Perſon; That teaches me the ſame, and alſo that the Father of our Lord Chriſt is that one God: both of them contrary to the Doctrine of the Trinity. 4. He ſaith; that there are Three Divine Perſons, each of which have (in Scripture) not only the Title, but the Nature and Attributes of God aſcribed to them. But where is the Holy Ghoſt called God in Scripture? He is indeed called the Spirit of God, but never God himſelf; and being the Power of God, 'tis no wonder that ſuch things are aſcribed to him, as are aſcribed to God himſelf. Thus it is ordinary to aſcribe to a Man's Courage, what he has done himſelf; and yet his Courage is no Perſon, nor diſtinct from him. This I ſay only by the way, to ſhew the ſtrangeneſs of his Conſequences. But I ſhall ſay nothing here of the Son: and indeed ſeeing he brings no particular Inſtances of what he advances, there is no need to inſiſt any longer upon it.

CHAP. III.

I come now to examine his Anſwers, to the Objections againſt the Trinity in the brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians.

THE Firſt Objection, *p.* 154. *If our Lord Chriſt were himſelf God; there could be no Perſon greater than He, none that might be called his Head or God, none that could in any reſpect command him.* Let us hear, How the Doctor anſwers this Objection. 'Now (ſaith he) 'this Argument is fallacious; for tho Chriſt 'be God himſelf, yet if there be Three Per'ſons in the God-head, the Equality and 'Sameneſs of Nature does not deſtroy the 'Subordination of the Perſons: A Son is 'Equal to his Father by Nature, but Inferior 'to him as his Son. Now where is the Fallacy, but in the Author's Anſwer? His Compariſon of a Father with his Son, is ſhort of his purpoſe: for tho a Son be equal to his Father by Nature, yet he is not equal to him in Authority and Power; and therefore a Father is truly greater than his Son, is *his Head*, and *can command him.* This is not meerly a Subordination of Order, but of Power and Authority alſo. But it is not ſo with the Father and Son in the Trinity: they are not only equal by Nature, in the Author's Hypotheſis, but in Power and Authority; as they have the ſame Nature, ſo they have the ſame Attributes, whereby they are equal to one another in all Things. Now if it be ſo; how can the Father be ſaid to be *greater* than the Son, *who is as great as himſelf?* How can he be called his *Head*, which imports ſome Authority over Chriſt. As appears from 1 *Cor.* 11. 3. *But I would have you know, that the Head of every Man is Chriſt; and the Head of the Woman is the Man; and the Head of Chriſt is God.* It appears by this place, that God is the Head of Chriſt, as Chriſt is the Head of every Man, and the Man the Head of the Woman. Now Chriſt's being the Head of every Man, imports ſome Power and Authority over every Man, as the Man's being Head of the Woman imports a Power and Authority over

ver the Woman; and conſequently God's being the Head of Chriſt, muſt import an Authority and Power over Chriſt; elſe the Compariſon would be unreaſonable, fallacious and impertinent. But, I ſay, how can God be called the Head of Chriſt, in ſuch a Senſe? if Chriſt be as Great, and have as great Power and Authority as God has, how can God be called *his God?* To be ones God, is as much as to be his Benefactor and his Protector, according to the ſtile of Scripture; but Chriſt being All-mighty and ſelf-ſufficient, how can the Father be ſtiled his God, that is, his Benefactor and Protector? *I aſcend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God*, John 20. 17. *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?* Mat. 27. 46. How could Chriſt ſay theſe things, on the Doctor's Hypotheſis; for being God as well as the Father, He muſt no leſs forſake himſelf, than the Father forſook him; and he might as well call himſelf *his own God*, and complain of himſelf that he had forſaken himſelf: Nay, being himſelf Almighty God as well as the Father, and being able to comfort himſelf in his Sufferings; how comes he to invoke the Father, or to call him *his God?* for thoſe Words plainly ſhew, that He expected and deſired from the Father the Aſſiſtance which He could not perform to Himſelf. Furthermore, how can we forbear conceiving Two Gods, according to this Hypotheſis? Chriſt, who invokes the Father, is God; the Father, whom He invokes, is God alſo; conſequently there are Two diſtinct Gods. Can he that invokes, and he that is invoked, be one and the ſame Being? I always thought that this ſuppoſed two ſeveral Beings. Laſtly, If our Lord Chriſt were himſelf God, how could any command him? He has all the Power and all the Authority, that the Father has; He is no more ſubject to the Father, than the Father to him; nay the Father and He are but One God.

The Author goes on; 'If the Father, as 'I have explained it, be original Mind and 'Wiſdom; the Son a Perſonal ſubſiſting, 'but reflex Image of the Father's Wiſdom; 'thô their Eternal Wiſdom be equal and 'the ſame, yet the Original is Superiour 'to the Image, the Father to the Son: And 'therefore thô I know ſuch Texts as he 'alledges, *My Father is greater than I; The 'Head of Chriſt is God; I aſcend to my Father 'and your Father, to my God and your God*; are 'both by Ancient and Modern Expoſitors 'applied to Chriſt's humane Nature; yet 'I ſee no Inconvenience, in owning this 'to be true, with reſpect to his Divine Perſon, and his Relation to the Father: For 'the Father is the Head and Fountain of 'the Deity; and therefore the Father may 'be called his God. Let us conſider this Paragraph.

The Son is a Perſonal Subſiſting, but Reflex Image of his Father's Wiſdom. What Gibberiſh is this! Has the Doctor found any where in Scripture, that the Son is *a Perſonal Subſiſting, but Reflex Image of his Father's Wiſdom?* Why does he not ſpeak the Language of Scripture? If his Words have any Senſe, he means, that the Father reflects upon his own Knowledge and Wiſdom: but how comes he to fancy, that a reflected Wiſdom, or to reflect on ones own Wiſdom, is a Divine Perſon and an Intelligent Being? One would think it only *an Act* of God, to reflect upon his own Knowledg, or other Perfections, without dreaming of a *Divine Perſon*; but Metaphyſicians, it ſeems, have a clearer Sight than other People: what is to others only an Act of God, the Metaphyſician diſcerns to be a Divine Perſon. 2. *The Original*, ſaith the Author, *is Superiour to the Image, the Father to the Son.* But the Superiority in the Trinity is only a Superiority of Order, which can admit of no ſuch Expreſſions as *Greater than Chriſt, the Head of Chriſt, the God of Chriſt*; as I ſhewed before. He ſees, he ſaith, no Inconvenience in owning this to be true with reſpect to Chriſt's *Divine Perſon*, and his Relation to his Father; becauſe the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity. I will ſhew more particularly, the ridiculouſneſs of this Aſſer-

tion, by inſiſting upon the firſt of the Paſſages before cited, as I have done upon the two others. Our Saviour ſeeing his Diſciples ſorrowful, becauſe He had told them, that He was going to his Father; and being willing to comfort them, and to leſſen their Sadneſs; tells them, (*John* 14. 18.) *If ye loved me, ye would rejoyce, becauſe I ſaid, I go unto the Father; For my Father is greater than I.* One would think that Chriſt's meaning is, That the Diſciples ſhould be glad to hear that he leaves the World to go to his Father; becauſe his Father being greater than He, would undoubtedly crown his Obedience with an immortal Glory, and a Name which is above every Name. But this Author has found out another Senſe, which is worth the obſerving; *If ye loved me, ye would rejoyce, becauſe I ſaid I go to the Father; for the Father is greater than I; that is to ſay, the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity.* This would have been a very unſignificant Comfort; Be not ſorrowful for my leaving this World and going to the Father; *For the Father is the firſt Perſon of the Trinity.* Yet this ought to be the Interpretation of this Paſſage, if the Author's Aſſertion be true. Now I think the true meaning of this Phraſe, the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity, ſhould be this, *the Father is the firſt God*; as the Son is the ſecond God, and the Holy Ghoſt the third God. This Author may ſay ſo, if he pleaſes; I ſhan't contradict him, for that's the Conſequence that flows naturally from his Principles. But I ſhall deny, that the Father may be called *the God of Chriſt:* if Chriſt be the ſupream God as well as his Father, how can the ſupream God have a God over him? The term *God* relates only to Creatures; God cannot be ſaid to be the God of any but Creatures; this, common Senſe and the whole Current of Scripture teaches. Yes, you'l ſay, the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity. I anſwer, therefore you may in your Hypotheſis call him the firſt God; but by no means the God of the Son or Spirit, to whom He is not Superiour in Power, Authority, or other Divine Attribute.

The Author ſpeaks an unintelligible Jargon in his following Paragraph, which (I think) there is no need to inſiſt on: Therefore I ſhall here leave it to every rational Man to judge, whether we ought to reſt ſatisfied with ſuch a trifling Anſwer to the propounded Objection.

The ſecond Objection, *p.* 155. 'If our 'Lord Chriſt were indeed God, it could 'not without Blaſphemy be (abſolutely and 'without Reſtriction) affirmed of him, that 'He is the Creature, the Poſſeſſion, the 'Servant, and the Subject of God. To this 'the Author anſwers thus; That Chriſt is 'called a Creature, he proves, becauſe He 'is *the Firſt-born of every Creature*, Col. 1. 15. 'But here he ſhould have remembred his '*Abſolutely, and without Reſtriction*; for Chriſt 'is ſo the Firſt-born of every Creature, that 'He is *the Image of the Inviſible God*, and therefore no Creature. Surely, an abſurd Conſequence: I ſay on the contrary; Chriſt is the Image of the Inviſible God, and therefore a Creature. Let us ſee which of us is in the right. Every one may plainly ſee that, when St. *Paul* calls Chriſt the Image of the Inviſible God, he means, that He is a Viſible Image of an Inviſible God; and therefore he added the Epithet *Inviſible*; which otherways had been uſeleſs, not to ſay ridiculous. For then the Senſe of the Apoſtle's Expreſſion muſt be this; Chriſt is the Inviſible Image of the Inviſible God. Now the Nature of an Image is to be viſible to every ones Eye; or elſe it is no Image: But if Chriſt is called the Image of the Inviſible God, becauſe He is the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity; this ſecond Perſon being as Inviſible as the firſt, it follows that Chriſt is an Image of God as Inviſible as the Original; which is ridiculous. No, no; the *Man* Chriſt is the Image of the Inviſible God, by reaſon of his unſpotted Holineſs, and of the ſupream Power and Authority conferred on him. He is the Brightneſs of God's Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon; but ſuch an Image as *was Viſible* while He lived upon Earth, and may *now be ſeen* of all the

In-

Inhabitants of Heaven. Beſides, it does plainly appear by the Context, that St. *Paul* calls Jeſus Chriſt *Man*, the Image of the Inviſible God. *Who* (the Father) ſaith he at Ver. 13. *has delivered us from the Power of Darkneſs, and has tranſlated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son.* Ver. 14. *In whom we have Redemption thrô his Blood, even the forgiveneſs of Sins.* Ver. 15. *Who is the Image of the Inviſible God, the Firſt-born of every Creature.* There you ſee, that He who is the Image of the Inviſible God, is that dear Son in whom we have Redemption thrô his Blood; but He who *ſhed his Blood* for the Redemption of Men, muſt be Jeſus Chriſt *Man*; therefore Jeſus Chriſt *Man* is the Image of the Inviſible God. Now let any unprejudiced Man judge, which of theſe two Conſequences is right, either this of the Author, Chriſt is the Image of the Inviſible God, therefore no Creature; or mine, Chriſt is the Image of the Inviſible God, therefore a Creature.

He goes on. ‘ He is ſo born before all Creatures, as πρωτότοκος alſo ſignifies, that ‘ *by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, ---and He is before all things* (which is the Explication of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, Begotten before the whole Creation, and therefore no part of the Creation) *and by him all things conſiſt.* ‘ Τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε, all things were ‘ not only made by him, but have their Subſiſtence in him.

Now let us ſuppoſe, that πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ought to ſignify *born before all Creatures*: I deny that, therefore Himſelf is no part of the Creation. The plain meaning of *born before all Creatures*, is, that Chriſt was born before any other Creature: As theſe Words, *Adam was born before all Men*, do not ſignify that he is no Creature, or no Man, but only that he was the firſt Man created. Therefore, I ſay, ſuppoſing that theſe Words πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, are well tranſlated by *born before all Creatures*, I may with great reaſon draw a Conſequence contrary to the Author's, thus; Chriſt is born before all Creatures, therefore He is part of the Creation Himſelf.

The Author is very unhappy at drawing Conſequences. Here is another as falſe as the former; ‘ That this does not relate to ‘ the New Creation, as the *Socinians* would ‘ have it, is very plain. For, 1. In this ‘ Senſe Chriſt (if He were a meer Man) was ‘ not the Firſt-born of every New Creature. ‘ For I hope, there were a great many New ‘ Creatures, that is, truly Good and Pious ‘ Men, before Chriſt was born of his Virgin ‘ Mother. What? ſuppoſing *the New Creation by the Goſpel*, is here meant; can't Chriſt as a meer Man be the Firſt-born of every New-Creature; being the *Meſſias*, the Author and firſt Preacher of the Goſpel, the Head of the Church, the Fountain from which the Holineſs of every New Evangelical Creature does ſpring? In a Word, being the Author of this New Evangelical Creation, can't He alſo be the Firſt-born of every New Evangelical Creature? Thoſe *Socinians* that he ſpeaks of, by the New-Creation mean nothing elſe, but the New-Creation wrought by Chriſt and his Goſpel: and therefore, either this Author impoſes on them; or is not fully acquainted with their Opinions; or has no great Skill in Reaſoning.

I ſee, the Author does not underſtand the above-cited place. Therefore I think it worth while to explain it; the rather, becauſe 'tis one of the ſtrongeſt Holds of the *Trinitarians*; and to ſhow, that inſtead of favouring their Opinion, it overthrows it. In order thereunto; 1. I will prove, that the Old Creation, that is the Creation of the World, is not intended in that Text. 2. I will ſet down, what I take to be the true Senſe of that whole Context.

1. That the Creation of the World is not there meant. This I ſhall prove by Four Arguments. 1. He who is the Firſt-born of every Creature, is the ſame who ſhed his Blood (*ver.* 14.) for the Redemption of Men; as I noted before. Now he who *ſhed his Blood* for the Redemption of Men, can be no other but Jeſus Chriſt, *Man*: but this very Jeſus Chriſt *Man* is there ſtiled *the Firſt-born of every Creature, by whom all things were created, &c.*

as

as we tranſlate the Words; Therefore this cannot be meant of the Creation of the World, which is the Work of God, not of a Man. Yes, you'l ſay; for He is God as well as Man; and therefore may be ſaid to have created the World. I anſwer; Where have you found in Scripture, that *Chriſt is God as well as Man?* I know He is called *Man* in the Writings of the New Teſtament; but I could never find him there ſtiled *God-Man*, as He ſhould have often been, if He was both. Does the Apoſtle make a diſtinction between his two Natures? does he ſay, we have Redemption thrô his Blood, *as He is a Man?* and that He is the Firſt-born of every Creature, and has created all Things, *as He is God?* Not at all; but only tells us, That the ſame Jeſus Chriſt, in whom we have redemption thrô his Blood, is the Firſt-born of every Creature, and by whom all Things were created, *&c.* Why ſhould we contrive a diſtinction of our own, when the Apoſtle makes none? But 2. I cannot but wonder, that Men ſhould attribute the old or firſt Creation to Chriſt, ſince we have no Warrant from Scripture for it: I mean, that the Scripture does never ſay in expreſs Words, that *Chriſt has created Heaven and Earth*, (which is the proper Deſcription of the Old Creation, or of the Creation ſtrictly and properly ſo called; and the Deſcription uſual in Scripture when it ſpeaks of that Creation) as it is ſaid that God *the Father of Chriſt* has. I do obſerve ſo great a difference between the Expreſſions of the Sacred Writers concerning the Creation of the World by God, and thoſe Expreſſions which are ſuppoſed to import the ſame Creation by Chriſt; that I cannot forbear alledging ſome places concerning both. I omit thoſe of the Old Teſtament, which are ſo many; and will inſiſt only upon ſome taken out of the New. *God* (ſaith St. *Paul*, *Acts* 17. 24.) *that made the World and all things therein, ſeeing that he is Lord of Heaven and Earth, dwelleth not in Temples made with Hands.* And Acts 4. 11. *Lord, thou art God, which haſt made Heaven, and Earth, and the Sea, and all that in them is.* Acts 14. 15. *We ---preach unto you, that ye ſhould turn from theſe Vanities, unto the Living God, which made Heaven, and Earth, and the Sea, and all things that are therein.* And Rev. 14. 7. *Fear God, ----and worſhip him, that made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and the Fountains of Water.* This is the true and proper Deſcription of the Creation of the World. Were it aſcribed to Chriſt in ſuch expreſs Terms, we could not doubt that Chriſt had created the World: which if the Apoſtles had believed, they would undoubtedly have taught us ſo great a Truth, and that both in expreſs and plain Terms, and often. No, Chriſt is never ſaid to have created *Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all that is therein.* In this very place the Apoſtle does not ſay, that the Firſt-born created Heaven and Earth; but *All things that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth*: and the *All Things* of which he ſpeaketh, he limiteth to all *Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and Powers*, viſible and inviſible; which ſhall be explained hereafter. This ſecond Reflection, that *this Text contains not the proper Deſcription of the Creation of the World uſed in Scripture*, being added to the foregoing, that *this Context ſpeaks of Chriſt as Man*; ought to perſwade any unprejudiced Man, that the Creation of the World is not here attributed to Chriſt. The Primitive Chriſtians were ſo far from believing, that Chriſt created the World; that, as *the Father* only is called *God* in the Apoſtles Creed, ſo He only is ſtiled *Maker of Heaven and Earth*. 3. As the Epiſtle to the *Galatians* is an excellent Commentary on the Epiſtle to the *Romans*; ſo the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* muſt be made uſe of, for the right underſtanding of the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*. The Deſign and Scope of thoſe two Epiſtles is the ſame; ſo that we muſt look into the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, to find out the true Senſe of this controverted Text in the *Coloſſians*. Now he that ſeriouſly compares theſe two Epiſtles with one another, will find that *Coloſſ.* 1. 15, 16, 17, 18. muſt be interpreted by *Epheſ.* 1. 20, 21, 22. and *Epheſ.* 1. 10. is a true Commentary on *Coloſſ.* 1. 20. *Coloſſ.* 1. 18. runs thus, *And He is the Head of the Body, the Church: who*

who is the Beginning, the First-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the preeminence. To which anſwers part of the 22*d verſe* in the *Epheſians*, in theſe Words; *And gave him to be Head over all things to the Church.* Col. 1. 15, 16, 17. runs thus; *Who is the Image of the inviſible God, the First-born of every Creature: for by him were all things created* (as we tranſlate the Word) *that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, viſible and inviſible; whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers: all things were created by him and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt.* To theſe Verſes do anſwer the 20, 21, and part of the 22*d* verſe of *Chap.* 1. to the *Epheſians*, in theſe Words; *He* (God) *raiſed him from the dead, and ſet him at his own right Hand in the Heavenly Places, far above all Principality and Power, and Might and Dominion, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his Feet.* Now in the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, we ſee, there is not the leaſt intimation of the Creation aſcribed to Chriſt; but only of his exaltation above all the Orders of Angels, and all earthly Powers: which plainly ſhows, that the Apoſtle meant not the Creation of the World in the forecited Verſes of the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*. Nay, were it ſo, he would ſpeak Non-ſenſe. In the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, he would tell us that Chriſt has created all the Orders of Angels, the viſible and inviſible Thrones, *&c.* which plainly ſhows that He is thereby as far above them, as the Creator is above his Creatures: but in the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* he would tell us, that Chriſt *has been exalted* far above all the Orders of Angels, and all Earthly Thrones and Powers; which undeniably proves, that He was not ſo before. Now what is a Contradiction, if this be not, to ſay that Chriſt created them, and that the Father ſet him far above them? We muſt therefore of neceſſity explain the Context of the *Coloſſians*, by that of the *Epheſians*; and put ſuch a Senſe upon it, as imports no true and proper Creation. 4. *Coloſſ.* 1. 19, 20. being interpreted by *Epheſ.* 1. 10. is a Confirmation of what I have ſaid hitherto. The former (*Coloſſ.* 1. 19, 20.) runs thus; *For it pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell; and* (*having made Peace through the Blood of his Croſs*) *by him to reconcile all things to himſelf; by him, I ſay, whether they be things in Earth, or things in Heaven.* To which anſwers the other Text (*Eph.* 2. 10.) in theſe Words; *That in the Diſpenſation of the fulneſs of time, he might gather together in one all things in Chriſt, both which are in Heaven, and which are in Earth, even in him.* No Man, I hope, will deny that ἀποκαταλλάξαι in the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, which we render *to Reconcile*, ought to be interpreted by ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι in the Text of the *Epheſians*, which ſignifies *to gather together in one*, or to *ſum up*. So that the meaning of both places is this, that it pleaſed God in the fulneſs of time, to unite both Angels and Men under one Head, even Chriſt, whom he ſet up Lord and King over them. Now this does perfectly agree with what St. *Paul* ſays to the *Epheſians*, concerning Chriſt's exaltation above all the Orders of Angels, and his being Head of the Church: for his Argument runs thus; God has exalted Chriſt above all the Orders of Angels, and made him Head of the Church, for he had decreed, in the fulneſs of time to unite both Angels and Men under one Head, Chriſt. But if the Text of the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, is meant of the Creation of the World; this will be perfect Non-ſenſe; for thus it ought to run: *Chriſt has created* all Orders of Angels, and all Powers on Earth, and was made Head of the Church; for *God had decreed*, in the fulneſs of time *to unite both Angels and Men under one Head, Chriſt.* No Man in the World can ſpeak greater Non-ſenſe than this would be, were the Creation of the World aſcribed to Chriſt in the controverted Text. I deſire the Author to reconcile his explication of theſe Words, *that in all things he might have the preeminence*, with what follows. That is (ſays he, at *p.* 157.) *that he might be the* πρωτεύων, *the First upon all accounts, before the Worlds, and the First-born from the dead.* So the whole Argument (according to the Author) muſt run

run thus; Chriſt was the Firſt upon all accounts, *before the Worlds*, and the Firſt-born from the Dead; for God was pleaſed, *in the fulneſs of time* to unite both Angels and Men under Chriſt, as their Head. Could any thing be ſaid more abſurd and ridiculous? The Author's Skill in Scripture and Reaſon is, I think, alike.

2. Having thus proved that the Old Creation, or the Creation properly ſo called, is not aſcribed to Chriſt in this Context of the *Coloſſians*; I come now to explain its true Senſe, as clearly as poſſibly I can. Ver. 15. *Who is the Image of the Inviſible God, the Firſt-born of every Creature.* The meaning of theſe laſt Words is not, that Chriſt was begotten before all Creatures, as this Author would have it, but that *He is the Lord and King of every* (Intelligent) *Creature*; in Alluſion to the Firſt-born of a Family, who is Heir of all Things. This I prove by the 17 and 18*th* Verſes; *Ver.* 17. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστι πρὸ πάντων, *And He is before all things*, is the Explication of *the Firſt-born of every Creature*; and ſignifies, not that He is before all Creatures in order of time, but of Dignity and Power, being by God ſet over all the Orders of Angels, and over the Church, as their Head and King. But if you don't reſt ſatisfied with this parallel Place, the 18*th* Verſe will afford an undeniable proof of what I ſay: There you find, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων, which is rightly rendred in our Bibles, *That in all things He might have the Preeminence*, both in Heaven and in Earth, among Angels and in the Church. I ſay now, theſe laſt Words ought to be the Explication of the two before-mentioned Expreſſions; to be *the Firſt-born of every Creature*, and to be *before all Things*, ought to be interpreted by his *having the Præeminence in all Things*: ſo that *He is the Firſt-born of every Creature*, is this, *He hath the Preeminence over every Creature.* Thus by the Context it ſelf, we find out the true ſenſe of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, which in the Engliſh we tranſlate *Firſt-born of every Creature*: And thus too are theſe Words interpreted by the principal Critics among the Orthodox, (as they are called) *Gomarus*, *Camero*, *Piſcator*, *Druſius*, *Vorſtius*, *Davenant*, *Daily*, *Grotius*, (for they will have him alſo to be Orthodox) *Hammond.*

I come now to the next Verſe, *For by him were all Things created.* I have fully proved, they cannot be underſtood of the Old Creation, the Creation of Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and of the Things in them, which is the Creation properly ſo called; therefore to reconcile this Verſe with the foregoing, and with the Words before cited out of the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, (*He* [God] *ſet Him at his own Right-Hand, far above all Principality and Power, — and every Name that is named*;) The word ἐκτίσθη, which we render *Created*, ought to be rendred *Modelled*, *Diſpoſed*, or *Reformed* into a new Order. So that the Senſe will run thus; 'Chriſt is *the Lord* of every Creature, 'for by him are all both Viſible and Inviſible Creatures, even all Men and Angels, 'Modelled or Diſpoſed into a new Order, 'being ſubjected to Him and His Commands: As for Angels, all the Orders of 'them, whether they be Thrones or Dominions, none of them are exempted from 'his Power and Authority; he rules over 'them, (which is the meaning of Ver. 17.) 'and they are all as it were compacted in 'one Body under his Conduct; as for Men, 'as He is the Beginning and the Firſt-born 'from the Dead, ſo He was alſo made Head 'of the Church his Body; ſo that in all 'things He has the Preeminence, He rules 'in Heaven and on Earth, over Angels and 'over the Church, which is the Senſe of Ver. 18. This I hope makes a clear Senſe, agreeable to the whole Context, and to the Text in the *Epheſians*. I obſerve that as καὶ αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων, or *He is before all Things*, is the Explication of πρωτότοκος, &c. Or *He is the Firſt-born of every Creature*: So καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε, or *and by him all Things conſiſt*, or are compacted into one Body, ought to be the Explication of ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, or *by him were*

all

all Things (not *created*, as 'tis rendred in the Engliſh, but) Modelled or Reformed. I know not, why Dr. *Sherlock* has called this a Socinian Explication; as if it were deviſed by them, to ſerve their Hypotheſis; the truth is, the chief of the Orthodox Interpreters, have thus explained this Context of the *Coloſſians*. Among the Ancients, St. *Cyril*, *Fulgentius*, *Procopius*, *Gazæus*, and even *Athanaſius* himſelf: Of the Moderns, *Salmero*, *Montanus*, *Grotius*, and many more. Before I put an end to this, I muſt obſerve; that our Author is greatly miſtaken in his Explication of *Col.* 1. 18. The Apoſtle (ſays he) proceeds from Chriſt's Creation of the natural World, to his Mediatory Kingdom: Which proves, that He did not ſpeak of that before. I ſee the Author does not obſerve his own rule (*p.* 146.) *To conſider, in expounding Scripture, what goes before, and what follows.* It was no hard matter to ſee, that the Apoſtle at Ver. 16. ſpeaks, Firſt in the general of Things that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, Viſible and Inviſible: but then afterwards he explains, what he meant by the Things that are in Heaven, *viz.* all the Orders of Angels; this he doth in the latter part of the ſame Verſe; and what he means by Things that are on Earth, He tells us fully at Ver. 18. *viz.* the Church. The 18*th* Verſe, being an Explication of ſome part of Ver. 16. it appears not to have been *Paul*'s Deſign, to proceed from Chriſt's Creation of the World to his Mediatory Kingdom.

Thus I have done with the famous Context of *Col.* 1. 15, 16, *&c.* The Author of *the Brief Hiſtory* had proved, that Chriſt was God's Miniſter and Servant, becauſe He was *appointed or made by God, the Apoſtle and High-Prieſt of our Profeſſion.* To this the Author, I am now conſidering, Anſwers; 'But here 'is *a Reſtriction* to his being High-Prieſt, 'and therefore no danger of Blaſphemy, 'tho He be God. For we may obſerve, 'that thô the Jewiſh High-Prieſt was but 'a Man, yet he was a type of an High-Prieſt 'who is more than Man, even the eternal 'Son, or *Word* of God; as ſome of the 'Learned Jews acknowledge. This is indeed an admirable Anſwer; Chriſt has been appointed by God an High-Prieſt, which ſeems to prove, that Himſelf is not God. No, ſays the Doctor, you are miſtaken; for thô the Jewiſh High-Prieſt was but a Man, yet He was a Type of an High-Prieſt more than Man, of an High-Prieſt who is the eternal Son of God. How does he prove it? *As ſome*, ſays he, *of the Learned Jews acknowledge.* And what then; if ſome Learned Jews have ſpoken non-ſenſe, muſt we ſpeak non-ſenſe too? One would expect, the Author ſhould prove by Scripture, and not by Jewiſh Writers, that the Jewiſh High-Prieſt was a type of an High Prieſt, who is the eternal Son and Word of God. The Jewiſh High-Prieſt being a Type of Chriſt, was a Type of an High-Prieſt more eminent and greater than Himſelf in all reſpects, thô he were not God.

He goes on. 'For the Son of God is 'the only proper Mediator and Advocate 'with the Father. If you ask him, why? he will anſwer; '*Philo Judæus*, who often 'calls the λόγος or *Word* the ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς or '*High-Prieſt*, ſays ſo; and ſhows that the 'Garments of the High-Prieſt were Figures 'of Heaven and Earth. Which ſeems to 'ſignify that the eternal Word which made 'the World, is the true High-Prieſt. Here comes upon the ſtage, one of his Learned Jews, *Philo*; by whoſe Teſtimony he proves, that the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity is the only proper Mediator and Advocate with the Father. But *Philo* being *Plato*'s Follower, did not believe ſuch a Trinity as the Doctor teaches. Sure there is a great difference between *Plato*'s three Principles, and the Doctor's Trinity. But if there were not; muſt we believe *Philo Judæus*, rather than St. *Paul*, who plainly tells us (in direct oppoſition to *Philo*) that as *there is One God*, ſo there is *One Mediator between God and Men, the MAN Chriſt Jeſus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. As for the Garments of the High-Prieſt, which *Philo* will have to be a Figure of

Heaven and Earth; and our Author's Story about *Feddus*; both which our Author alledges as Arguments, at leaſt as Congruities, whereby to prove the Divinity of Chriſt; I ſhall ſo far truſt the Judgment of the meaneſt Reader, as to take no notice of them. That which follows, is no leſs ridiculous; 'I am 'ſure (ſays the Author) the Apoſtle diſtin-'guiſhes Chriſt from *High-Prieſts taken from* '*among Men*, and makes his Sonſhip the 'Foundation of his Prieſthood, *Heb.* 5. 1, 6. The contrary to both theſe is true, and evident alſo in the Text he cites. The Prieſthood is the Foundation of the Sonſhip; and *Aaron* and Chriſt are there made Inſtances of High-Prieſts taken from among Men. The Objection therefore remains ſtill; that Chriſt being an High-Prieſt appointed and *made by God*, cannot Himſelf be God.

He goes on: 'As for his next Objection '(from 1 *Cor.* 3. 23.) *Chriſt is God's*. I 'know not what he means by it; for there 'is no doubt but Chriſt is God's Son, God's 'Chriſt, God's High-Prieſt, ſerves the Ends 'and Deſigns of God's Glory; and what 'then? Therefore he is not God: by no 'means! he may conclude that He is not 'God the Father; becauſe He acts ſubor-'dinately; not that therefore He is not 'God the Son. The Author of the *Brief* '*Hiſtory* meant (I ſuppoſe) this; that as [*you* '*are Chriſt's*] in that Text, ſignifies Men are ſubject to Chriſt; ſo [*Chriſt is God's*] muſt ſignify, Chriſt is ſubjected to God, and therefore not Himſelf God. This I think is good Senſe, and a good Argument. But can it be ſaid, that the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, who is the ſupream God; nay, One God with the Firſt, is God's Son, God's Chriſt, God's High Prieſt, ſerves the Ends and Deſigns of God's Glory? All theſe Titles denote a dependance upon the Father, and a real ſubjection to Him; which cannot agree to any Perſon who is indeed Himſelf a Supream God.

Here is another ſenſleſs Anſwer, to a good and ſtrong Objection. 'P. 158. His next 'proof is; That God calls Chriſt his Ser-'vant in the Prophet *Iſaiah*. But it is his 'Servant *in whom his Soul was pleaſed*; which 'is the peculiar Character of his Son; and 'is that very Teſtimony which God gave to 'Chriſt at his Baptiſm, *This is my beloved* '*Son in whom I am well pleaſed*. I deſire here the Reader to obſerve the Doctor's accurate way of reaſoning. This is the Objection: Chriſt is called God's Servant, therefore He is not God. No, this is a miſtake, ſays He; for Chriſt is God's *beloved* Servant.

P. 159. He ſays in anſwer to the Objection from *Phil.* 2. 8, 9. 'Becauſe He volun-'tarily condeſcends below the Dignity of 'his Nature; does He forfeit the Dignity of 'his Nature? But I aſk; can it be ſaid of the Supream God, *with whom is no Variable-neſs, neither Shadow of turning*, that He has condeſcended below the Dignity of his Nature?

P. 159, 160. He goes on in a florid way of Speech to ſhow, how inconſiſtent it is that Chriſt, were He a meer Creature, ſhould be advanced to that Power and Authority, whereunto He has been promoted.

Hereupon I obſerve; 1. The Dignity conferred upon Chriſt ought not to be called, *the Supream* Government of the World; as this Author has ſtiled it: For He acts and governs in Subordination to his Father. 2. When the Scripture ſpeaks of this Advancement of Chriſt, it extends it eſpecially over Angels and Men. 3. It is *no Indignity* to Angels, as our Author pretends, to be ruled and governed by a Man, whom God has exalted above them. Angels indeed have ſome natural Prerogatives above Men, whereby they are more excellent Creatures than Men: but if it pleaſes God of his free Gift, to inveſt a Man with greater Dignity, Power, and all other Excellence, than any Angel has; why can't He be ſet over them, as their Lord and Ruler, in Subordination to God? There is no Incongruity in it. 4. That, contrary to the Author's Aſſertion, a meer Creature may be a fit Lieutenant or Repreſentative of God in Perſonal and Prerogative Acts of Government or Power.

Thus

Thus *Saul* and *David* were ſet over the *Iſraelites*, to govern and rule over them by God's Appointment, in Subordination to him. Nay we do commonly ſay, That the King is the Lieutenant and Repreſentative of God. 5. God communicated to Chriſt ſuch Wiſdom and Power, as is neceſſary to enable him to exerciſe the Dignity conferred on him. In all this, there is not the leaſt *Inconſiſtency*.

But notwithſtanding his foregoing Objections, he confeſſes, the Difficulty remains. *P.* 161. 'If He be by Nature the Son of 'God, and Natural Lord of the World; how 'is He ſaid to be exalted by God, and to 'receive a Kingdom from him, as the re-'ward of his Righteouſneſs and Sufferings? 'He was before poſſeſſed of it, ever ſince 'the Foundation of the World; being na-'tural Lord of all his Creatures: He had 'no need to receive that which was his 'own, or purchaſe what was his natural 'Right, by ſuch mean and vile Condeſcen-'ſion as ſuffering Death on the Croſs. Now to reconcile this, he makes a long Diſcourſe concerning *the Mediatory Kingdom* of Chriſt; which (ſaith he) hath been beſtowed on the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, and is peculiar to Him, and diſtinguiſhed from the Natural Government of the World, which He has in Conjunction with the Father. This Chimerical Syſtem I may overthrow, I think, by that ſingle Text of St. *Paul* already cited; *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the MAN Chriſt Jeſus.* If Chriſt is a Mediator, and has the Mediatory Kingdom, as He is the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, that is, as He is God; why does the Apoſtle tell us, that He is a Mediator bearly as He is Man? At leaſt he ſhould have told us, that the Mediator is the *God-Man* Jeſus Chriſt. It is unaccountable that the Apoſtle, who in all his Epiſtles ſets forth the Excellency and Glory of Chriſt, in the moſt expreſſive Terms; ſhould tell us that the MAN Chriſt Jeſus is the Mediator between God and Men, if the Mediatory Kingdom is exerciſed by the Divine Perſon or Nature, and if (not Chriſt *Man*, but) Chriſt God is the Mediator. But let us examine the Grounds our Author goes on.

He tells us, *ibid.* 'A Mediatory King-'dom was neceſſary, to reconcile God and 'Men; to reſtore Man to the Integrity of 'his Nature: and this Power and Dignity 'God beſtowed on his own Son; who had 'the moſt Right to it, and was the beſt 'qualified for it, being *the begotten Word* 'and *Wiſdom* of the Father. Now one would expect, he ſhould cite ſome Texts of Scripture, to prove this Aſſertion; but he could find no place to rely on. But Chriſt muſt, ſays he, firſt become Man, and perform the whole Will of God, and then He ſhall be exalted. Whereupon he makes this Obſervation; (*pag.* 162.) 'All the 'Power Chriſt is inveſted with, is as Head 'of the Church: *God has put all Things under his Feet; and given him to be Head over all Things to the Church; which is his Body, the Fulneſs of him that filleth all Things*; 'Eph. 1. 22, 23. That is, ſaith he, God 'has made him Governour of the World, 'as Head of the Church. I obſerve two Things upon this place. 1. That this Text is not well interpreted. The firſt part of it relates to the foregoing Verſe, and ought to be explained by it: God, ſaith the Apoſtle, at Ver. 21. *Set Chriſt at his own Right-Hand in the Heavenly Places, far above all Principality and Power, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but in that which is to come.* Ver. 23. *And hath put all Things under his Feet.* What Things? Thoſe that are before mentioned, all the Orders of Angels and all Earthly Powers. And then follows; *And gave him to be Head*, &c. This is the ſenſe; not, that Chriſt was made Governour of the whole World, as Head of the Church. 2. But, what if all the Power Chriſt is inveſted with, is as Head of the Church? Will it not follow, that all the Power He is inveſted with, is as a Man, not as God? And this alſo I prove by *Col.* 1. 18. *And He is the Head of the Body the Church, who is the Beginning, the Firſt-born from the Dead.*

He who is the First-born from the Dead, can be no other but the MAN Jesus Christ; but He who is the First-born from the Dead, is the Head of the Church, as that Text expresly saith: therefore the MAN Christ Jesus is the Head of the Church. Thus the Apostle very plainly telling us; that the Mediator and Head of the Church is the Man Christ Jesus, destroys our Author's Notion of Christ's Mediatory Kingdom, or that it is grounded on and exercised by his Divine Nature or Person. Further, if Christ *God* is the Mediator, if the Mediatory Kingdom belongs to and is managed by the second Person of the (supposed) Trinity, I don't see, how the Government of *Israel* can be a Type of this Kingdom, as this Author says at *p.* 162, 163. For the King of the *Israelites* was between God and his People, and was really *diverse from both*; but Christ in our Author's Hypothesis, is God himself, *One with the Father* and the Holy Ghost; so that he must be a Mediator between himself and Men, which besides that it is contrary to the Notion of a Mediator, does wholly destroy the Parallel.

He says at *pag.* 164, 165. that, 'We certainly know from the Expositions of Christ 'and his Apostles, that the Prophets spake 'of Christ under the Names of *Lord*, *God*, 'and *Jehovah*. But I desire him, to reconcile these Texts with his Opinion; *Heb.* 1. 1, 2. *God, who at sundry Times and in divers Manners, spake in times past to the Fathers by the Prophets; hath in these Last Days spoken unto us by his Son.* Heb. 2. 2, 3. *For if the Word spoken by Angels was stedfast*; — *How shall we escape, if we neglect so great Salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord?* Gal. 3. 19. The Law *was ordained by Angels, in the Hand of a Mediator*, i. e. by the Intervention of *Moses*. Acts 7. 53. *Who have received the Law by the Disposition of Angels.* Ver. 38. *This* [Moses] *is He who was with the Church in the Wilderness, with the Angel who spake to him in Mount* Sinai. These Texts do more than sufficiently prove, that the Son of God is not meant by the Prophets and other Writers of the Old Testament, where they mention *the Lord*, *God*, and *Jehovah*. But to return to Christ's Mediatory Kingdom.

He says *pag.* 167. 'The Son has *a Kingdom* 'of his own, which is *peculiarly his*; and administred in his Name, and by his Sovereign 'Authority. But, how is this consistent with what we read *pag.* 168. 'The Power indeed 'whereby he administers his Kingdom, is the 'Power of the whole Trinity, of Father, 'Son, and Holy Ghost: for they being essentially one God, have but one Energy and 'Power, and therefore can never act separately. How can the Son, or the second Person of that Trinity, have *a Kingdom of his own*: if whatever he does, is also done by the Father and Holy Ghost; have not they hereby as great a share in this Kingdom, as the Son? This therefore is a plain Contradiction, and perfect Non-sense. Let us hear him further, *pag.* 169, 170. 'The Power is 'not taken out of God's Hands, that is impossible: Father, Son and Holy Ghost govern the World still, by one individual Act 'and Power; but as in the Natural Government of the World, the exercise of this 'Power begins with the Father; so in the 'exercise of this Mediatory Kingdom, it begins with the Son, and is directed by his 'Mediation. That is, God governs the World 'now, not meerly as a Natural Lord, by the 'Rules of Natural Justice; but with respect 'to the Mediatory Power and Authority of 'his Son, and to serve the ends of his Mediatory Kingdom. This Chimerical reasoning will not free the Author's System from Contradiction. For as in the Natural Government of the World, tho (as he dreams) the exercise of the Power begins with the Father, yet the Son and Holy Spirit acting in conjunction with the Father, *by an individual Act*; it cannot be said that the Power or Kingdom is peculiar to the Father: so in the supposed Mediatory Kingdom, tho the exercise of the Power begins with the Son; yet as long as the Father and Holy Spirit act together with him, and can never act separate-

ly;

ly; it cannot be ſaid, that *the Son has a Kingdom of his own*, or that he is the Mediatory King, more than the Father or Spirit. Yet by the help of this contrived Mediatory Kingdom, our Author undertakes (at *page* 173.) to overthrow the Fourth Argument in the Hiſtory of the *Unitarians*; even this, becauſe God doth all things in his own Name, and by his own Authority, but Chriſt comes in the Father's Name, does his Will, and ſeeks his Glory. 'This only proves (ſays he) that 'he is not the Father but the Son, and the 'King of God. For this Mediatory Kingdom '(as he ſays at *pag.* 172.) is erected by the 'Father; and by him given to the Son. But I ask, is not the Son equal to the Father, both in Energy and Authority? How then can he be ſaid to be ſent by his Father, to receive his Commands, and to ſeek his Glory? Can all this be aſcribed to the Supream God? Nay, if the Father together with the Son and Spirit, be but one God; is it not abſurd to ſay that the Father ſends the Son, and the Son does the Will of the Father? Why not rather, in his own Mediatory Kingdom, does his own Will, ſeeks his own Glory? I think, I could as ſoon believe White is Black, as ſwallow the Abſurdities of our Author's Mediatory Kingdom. But 'tis plain to every diſcerning Reader, that he has often not underſtood what he ſaid.

Having thus ſhown the Abſurdity of his Hypotheſis, concerning Chriſt's Mediatory Kingdom: I will ſet down in a few Words, what I take to be the true Notion of Chriſt's Kingdom. God had promiſed to *David*, that he would eſtabliſh his Throne for ever; and there ſhould never be wanting one of his Seed to ſit thereon; Pſal. 89. 3, 4. *I have made a Covenant with my Choſen, I have ſworn unto* David *my Servant; thy Seed will I eſtabliſh for ever, and build up thy Throne to all Generations.* And again, verſ. 29. *His Seed will I make to indure for ever, and his Throne as the Days of Heaven.* Again ver. 35, 36, 37. *Once I have ſworn by my Holineſs, that I will not lie unto* David: *his Seed ſhall indure for ever, and his Throne as the Sun before me; it ſhall be eſtabliſht for ever as the Moon, and as a faithful Witneſs in the Heavens.* Now that this Promiſe does not relate, only or chiefly, to *David*'s Succeſſors in the Political Government of *Iſrael*, without any reſpect to the *Meſſias*, who was alſo the Son of *David*; does plainly appear by the Event: for the Political Kingdom of *David* has been deſtroyed for ſeveral Ages, and the Series of Succeſſors in the *Davidical* Line is utterly broken off. This Promiſe therefore had its full Accompliſhment in our *Meſſias* Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Son of *David*, and the King of *Iſrael*. But this Kingdom of Chriſt is both more ample and more durable than *David*'s was. For *all Power is given to him, both in Heaven and Earth*, Mat. 28. 18. And (1 Cor. 15. 25, 26.) *He muſt reign, till he has put all Enemies under his Feet; the laſt Enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed, is Death.* Thus his Throne ſhall indure as long as the Sun and Moon. He may be called, with greater reaſon than *David* was (Pſal. 89. 27.) *God's Firſt-born, Higher than the Kings of the Earth:* for he is (*Rev.* 19. 16.) *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*; (Rev. 1. 5.) *Prince of the Kings of the Earth.* But his Power reaches not only over Men, but over Angels too; (1 Pet. 3. 22.) *He is on the right hand of God, Angels, and Authorities, and Powers being made ſubject to him.* This is God's Anointed, whom he has inveſted with the Power of enacting Laws for the good of his Subjects. When God did not ſo immediately govern *Iſrael*, as during the Theocracy, but by Kings; *David*, as God's Deputy and Vicegerent, appointed Muſick, Singers, Porters; and made ſuch other Regulations, as were fit in the Worſhip of God: So Chriſt, who is a King immediately appointed by God, by virtue of the Power *and Inſtructions* given to him, took away the Ceremonial Law, ſet up a Spiritual Worſhip; and being a King over the Gentiles as well as over the Jews, made ſuch Laws as were able to unite them into one Body, in the Worſhip of one God; that there might be but one Flock, and one Shepherd. Chriſt's Kingdom is not only Spiritual, but Temporal; I mean, he has ſo much Power over all Creatures, as

is

is neceſſary to enable him, to perform the ends of his Spiritual Kingdom. Nor is this contradicted by our Saviour's Words, at *John* 18.36. The Original has it not, *My Kingdom is not of this World*, but *from* this World. ἐκ τȣ̃ κόσμȣ τȣ́τȣ, i. e. My Kingdom is not owing to Men, but to God's own appointment: I am a King indeed, but this Kingdom I received from God's own Hands: My Kingdom is *not from hence*, as he explains it, but from above. Acts 2.36. *God has made that ſame Jeſus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Chriſt*, i. e. *King*. And chap. 17.31. *He has appointed a Day, in which he will judge the World in Righteouſneſs, by the MAN whom he has ordained.* 1 Cor. 15.24, 28, *Then cometh the end, when he ſhall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father. ----Then ſhall the Son be alſo ſubject to him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*

This, I take to be the true account of Chriſt's Kingdom, according to Scripture. Thus God performed the Oath, which he ſware to *David*; even by *raiſing up an Horn of Salvation in his Houſe*, Luke 1.69. Thus the Kingdom of Chriſt, who is the Seed of *David*, ſhall laſt as long as the Sun and Moon. But we no where find in Scripture, that this Kingdom is beſtowed upon him, as he is the Eternal Son of God, and Second Perſon of the Trinity. St. *Paul* was ſo far from believing that; that diſcourſing of the principal Act of Chriſt's Kingly Power and Authority, *viz.* his judging the World; he ſays, that *God* has appointed a Day to perform this, by the MAN whom he has ordained, *Acts* 17.31. In a Word, as Chriſt has been exalted by God, and has received a Kingdom from him: So when the appointed End cometh, he ſhall deliver it up to God, and remain SUBJECT to him, as St. *Paul* expreſly teaches, 1 *Cor.* 15.28. Theſe two things demonſtratively prove, that Chriſt is a King, barely as a Man; and that his Mediatory Kingdom, ſo much ſpoken of by our Author, is a Chimera.

I proceed now to his other Anſwers, to this Objection, That Chriſt knows not the day of Judgment. He replies (*pag.* 177.) 'Chriſt in that Text ſpeaks of himſelf as 'Man: St. *Matthew* does not mention *the Son*, 'which ſhews that the Son is included in 'St. *Matthew*'s οὐδεὶς, *None*, or no Man; and 'therefore theſe Texts muſt ſpeak of Chriſt 'only as a Man. I anſwer, ſo they do, for he is no more than a Man. St. *Mark* tells us, that Chriſt as *the Son* (of God) knows not that Day and Hour. Now our Author will have Chriſt's *Sonſhip* founded in his Eternal Generation from the Father; and that he is *the Son* not as he is Man, but as he is God, ſo he ſaith at *pag.* 166. and elſewhere. This is indeed a very eaſy diſtinction, were it but true: but *Trinitarians* are the Authors of it, not Scripture. In St. *Mark*'s Gradation Chriſt is named after Men and Angels, to ſhew his preſent Excellence and Exaltation above them: but in St. *Matthew*, that very Son of God, who is above Men and Angels, is included in the *None*, or no Man. Thus this glorious Title of *the Son* of God, denotes here Chriſt *Man*. As *the Father* in St. *Mark* is God; ſo *the Son* of God, who knows not that Day and Hour, is Chriſt *Man*, who is ſo ſtiled in all the New Teſtament without any reſpect to a ſecond Nature.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

THE ſixth Argument in the *Brief Hiſtory* runs thus: 'God giveth what, and 'to whom He pleaſes; He needs not the 'aid of any other; He intreateth not for 'Himſelf or his People; He cannot die; 'and deriveth his Power from none but 'Himſelf: But 'tis certain, that the Lord 'Chriſt could not himſelf, without the pre-'vious Ordination of the Father, confer the 'prime Dignities of Heaven, or of the 'Church. He placed his Safety in his Fa-'ther's Preſence and Help; he prayed often 'and fervently to the Father, both for him-'ſelf and for his Diſciples; he died, and 'was raiſed from the Dead by the Father; 'after his Reſurrection he received from 'another, all that great Power which he 'now injoys. To this he anſwers; 'Chriſt 'interceeds with no Creature, receives Au-'thority from no Creature, *&c.* nor from 'any God neither, who is ſeparated from 'himſelf: For he is One God with the Fa-'ther and the Holy Ghoſt. That he inter-'ceeds with the Father, proves indeed that 'he is a diſtinct Perſon from the Father; 'not, that he is not one God with him. But why, I pray, does it not prove that, he is not one God with the Father? For if he intercedes with God, can he be that very God with whom he intercedes? if he is, what need is there for him to intercede? Beſides; this Author ſays before (*pag.* 167, 169, 170.) *The Three Divine Perſons can never act ſeparately, they have but One Energy*, and whatever is done they do it *by one Individual Act*. Now I hope he will grant, that Prayer and Interceſſion are real Acts or Actions: I infer, therefore when the Son intercedes, the Father and Holy Spirit muſt intercede too. Thus Interceſſion and Prayer are not peculiar to the Son; but there are in the Godhead three Interceſſors, three Beſeeching Perſons. Whom, what Perſon or God, does this Trinity beſeech? Good God! how long ſhall it be, that Men will love Darkneſs rather than Light; and prefer a Novel and Unintelligible Goſpel, before the old, plain and eaſy One?

Pag. 183. He ſays; 'For God to make 'a Creature, Advocate and Mediator, is to 'give a Creature Authority over himſelf; 'which cannot be: for it is a Debaſement 'to the Divine Nature, and a reproach to 'the Divine Wiſdom; it is as if God did 'not better know, how to diſpoſe of his 'Grace and Mercy, than any Creature does. But why ſo? has our Author forgot, or is he to learn, that *Moſes*, thô a meer Crea-ture, was a Mediator between God and his People? I am ſure, St. *Paul* calls him ſo in theſe Words, at *Gal.* 3. 19. *The Law was ordained by Angels, in the Hand of a Mediator.* And at *Deut.* 5. 5. *He ſtood between the Lord and them, to ſhew them the Word of the Lord.* And the ſame Apoſtle tells us, that the MAN Jeſus Chriſt is a Mediator between God and Men. Does not the Scripture mention *Moſes* his Interceſſion with God; and that God was moved by his Intreaty? Why then does this Author affirm; that *to intercede with the Authority of a Mediator, is above the Nature and Order of Creatures?*

To the next Argument; *viz.* That Jeſus Chriſt is in Holy Scripture always ſpoken of, as a diſtinct and different Perſon from God; and deſcribed to be the Son of God, and the Image of God. He anſwers, 'This we own, 'and he had no need to prove it: This is 'a wonderful Argument to convince thoſe, 'who acknowledg Three diſtinct Perſons in 'the Godhead; that Chriſt is not God be-'cauſe he is a diſtinct Perſon from the Fa-'ther;

'ther; for ſo according to the Language of 'Scripture, *God* ſignifies *God the Father*, when 'he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy 'Spirit; as all Men grant. Let the Author abate a little of his Confidence. Is an Ironical Anſwer ſufficient, to confute a good and a ſtrong Argument? This is *a wonderful Argument*, ſays he, to prove that Chriſt is not God. When St. *Paul* ſays in his Salutations, *Grace be to you, and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; who would gueſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is God as well as the Father? he, nor any other ſacred Writer ever ſays, that there are Three Perſons in the Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; he calls only the Father, *God*, and diſtinguiſhes the Lord Chriſt from him. If the Lord Chriſt is God as well as the Father, the Apoſtle ſhould have framed his Salutation thus; *Grace be to you, and Peace from God the Father; and from the God Man Jeſus Chriſt*. But according to the Language of Scripture, ſays he, *God* ſignifies *God the Father*, when he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit. I anſwer; that is a Demonſtration, that the Father only is God; elſe the Title *God* could not be appropriated to him, when he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Spirit. And to diſcern ſo much, a Man can lack nothing but common Senſe. But I obſerve farther to this Anſwer; that ſuppoſing Chriſt were but a Man, the Apoſtle could have expreſſed himſelf no otherways; from whence it follows, that either the Apoſtle did indeed ſo think, and ſo teach; or this Author muſt charge him, as not knowing how to ſpeak correctly and properly.

'Tis impoſſible, ſaith the *Brief Hiſtory*, 'that the Son or Image of the One true 'God, ſhould himſelf be that One true 'God; as impoſſible as that the Son ſhould 'be the Father, or the Image that very 'Thing whoſe Image it is. 'This is meer 'Sophiſtry, ſaith our Author; for if the 'Father and the Son and the Holy Ghoſt 'be the One true God; they are the ſame 'One true God, and yet the Father is not 'the Son, nor the Son the Father. I appeal to the Reader, whether this be not a mear denial of the Difficulty, not an Explication or a Solution of it? The Son, ſaith the Hiſtorian, can't be the One true God, becauſe he is the Son and Image of the One true God; for the Son cannot be the Father, nor the Image the very Thing whoſe Image it is. Yes, ſays our Anſwerer, God and the Image of God *are the ſame One true God*.

The next Argument of the *Hiſtory* is, that 'Many Texts expreſly declare, That 'only the Father is God. In anſwer to this, ſays our Author: 'This would be a 'Demonſtration, could he produce any one 'Text which aſſerts, that only the Father, 'in oppoſition to the Son and Holy Ghoſt, 'is God: for then the Father muſt ſignify the Perſon of the Father, in oppoſition 'to the Perſon of the Son, and the Perſon 'of the Holy Ghoſt. But has not the Hiſtorian produced ſuch a Text? *John* 17. 3. *Father, — this is Life Eternal, to know Thee [the ONLY true God] and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent:* Or, Jeſus Chriſt thy Meſſenger. Here, *the Father*, to whom the Son directs his Prayer (as appears by Ver. 1.) is called *the only true God*; and the Son, Jeſus Chriſt *whom he hath ſent*, or his Meſſenger. Here the Father as the Sender, *is oppoſed* to the Son as the Meſſenger; and the Firſt called the ONLY true God, the Other an Apoſtle or Meſſenger. Our Author adds; 'But when the Father is called the only true 'God, only in oppoſition to all the falſe 'Gods, which the World then worſhipped; 'there *Father* does not ſignify *Perſonally*, 'but that one Godhead or Divinity, of which 'the Father is the Source, the Fountain 'and the Original. So ſoon has this Author forgot his own Obſervation and Rule of Interpretation, that, *according to Scripture, God ſignifies God the Father, whenever he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son or Spirit*. Is not he, to whom Chriſt here directs his Prayer, called *God?* and is he not diſtinguiſhed from the Son, who is called *the Meſſenger?* why then ſhould he not ſignify here *Perſonally*,

ly, God the Father, as well as in other places? why muſt *Father* here ſignify, *not the Father*; *but one Godhead, of which the Father is the Source?* Thus either his Obſervation is falſe; and then he is overthrown by the Texts to which he oppoſes it: or it is true; and then in this Text, *the only true God* is affirmed by our Saviour himſelf to be *the Father only*, in oppoſition to all other Perſons whomſoever. I cannot but admire this Author's way of expounding Scripture. One while, he founds Chriſt's Sonſhip on his eternal Generation; ſo that the title *Son* denotes *begotten Wiſdom* the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity: as ſoon as this notion will not ſerve the turn; as when the Son is (in St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*) denied to know the Day and Hour of Judgment; then *the Son* ſhall ſignify Chriſt *Man*. Again, when God is diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit, he ſignifies *Perſonally* God the Father; this Notion ſhall ſerve us againſt many Socinian ſayings of Scripture, againſt all the Texts in the ſeventh Argument of the Hiſtory: But when *John* 17. 1, 3. and the like Texts are urged; then on the contrary, God the Father muſt not ſignify the Father Perſonally, but one Godhead, or Divinity, of which the Father is the Source. Certainly, were his Hypotheſis true, there would be no need he ſhould thus turn himſelf into all Shapes to defend it.

When the Father is called, *the one God*, and *the only true God*; in oppoſition to all falſe Gods: is he not ſo called in oppoſition to the Son alſo? Moſt certainly he is. In theſe two Texts, *John* 17. 3. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. we have no warrant from Reaſon or Scripture, to underſtand by *the Father* Three Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Is it not abſurd and ſenſeleſs to ſay, That *the Father* ſignifies alſo the Son and Holy Ghoſt, in thoſe very Texts where he is diſtinguiſhed from them? I always thought *the Father* ſignified, the Father only; and *the Son*, the Son only, and *Holy Ghoſt*, the Holy Ghoſt only. I always thought that the Language of Scripture, was agreeable to the Language of Men; becauſe otherways it cannot be underſtood by Men: and therefore that *Father* muſt not be underſtood to be Father and Son, and a third Perſon diſtinct from both. But Trinitarians, better ſighted than other People, have found, it may. When we read in Scripture, (1 *Cor.* 8. 6.) *To us there is but one God, the Father*: It ſounds as if the Apoſtle had ſaid; There is but one numerical infinite Being, the Father of Jeſus Chriſt, and of all the World; becauſe this is the natural Idea we have of *one God*, *the Father*. But this Author tells us, we are groſly miſtaken; for *one God* ſignifies three infinite Minds, three ſubſtantial intellectual Beings or Perſons. Again, we ſhould think that *the Father* here ſignifies *the Father only*: but this is (it ſeems) another foul Miſtake; for it ſignifies beſides the Father, a Son and an Holy Spirit different from both. Nay, we muſt not think that the very expreſs Words (at *Mat.* 24. 36.) *the Father only*, do indeed ſignify the Father only; but the Father, the Son, and another Perſon; even tho the Son is there expreſly ſaid not to know the Day and Hour of Judgment, and that *the Father only* knows it. Theſe are ſome of the Illuminations with which our Author and his Party has bleſt the World.

He goes on, and ſays; the Diſpute muſt end here, whether the Scripture does teach the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; for if ſo, when the Father is ſaid to be *the only true God*, and *the one God*; the Son and Holy Spirit are not hereby excluded from the Unity of the ſame Godhead. I anſwer, the Diſpute may be ſoon ended; for when the Father is called the one God, and the only true God, even in thoſe places where the Son is mentioned: This alone is a clear Demonſtration, that the Scripture does not teach the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt. Were the Son and Holy Ghoſt God with the Father, the Prayer of our Lord (at *John* 17. 1, 2, 3, &c.) muſt have been thus framed; 'This is Life Eternal, to know 'Thee (Father) *and Me and the Holy Ghoſt* 'to be the only true God. And *Paul* to

the *Corinthians* ſhould have ſaid; 'But to 'us there is but one God, the Father, *the Son*, 'and *the Holy Ghoſt*. But this is the Language of Scripture, no where.

Pag. 186. 'His other Texts, ſaith our 'Author, prove no more but that the Father 'of Chriſt is God; not, that Chriſt is not 'one God with the Father. Let us hear the Texts themſelves, 1 Cor. 15. 24. *Then cometh the end, when he ſhall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father.* James 3. 9. *Therewith bleſs we God, even the Father.* Rom. 15. 6. *That ye may with one Mind, and one Mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* It is an affected blindneſs and perverſeneſs, not to diſcern and own, that in theſe Texts, *God even the Father*, is as much as to ſay, *God, that is to ſay the Father.* No plainer or more expreſs Words could be uſed by a *Socinian* or other *Unitarian*, to declare his Notion of the Unity of God. What hope is there of convincing thoſe, with whom *the Father only* ſhall not ſignify the Father only? And again, *God, that is to ſay the Father*, ſhall be two others beſides the Father.

CHAP. V.

THE next Argument. 'If Chriſt were 'indeed God as well as Man; or (as '*Trinitarians* ſpeak) *God the Son* Incarnate; 'it had been altogether ſuperfluous, to give 'the Holy Spirit to his ſaid Human Nature, 'as a Director and Guide: for what other 'help could that Nature need, which was 'one Perſon with (as they ſpeak) *God the Son*; 'and in which God the Son did Perſonally 'dwell? To this he anſwers: 'The account 'of this is plain and ſhort; for the whole 'Trinity is but one Energy and Power, and 'the Divine Perſons cannot act ſeparately *ad extra*: what the Father does, that the Son 'does, and that the Holy Ghoſt does by one 'Individual Act. But the Sanctification of 'all Creatures (and ſuch is the Human Nature of Chriſt) is peculiarly attributed to 'the Holy Spirit. But if the whole Trinity is but one Energy and Power, the Sanctification of Chriſt's Human Nature (or of any other Creature) can by no means be peculiarly attributed to the Holy Ghoſt; why to the Holy Ghoſt rather than to the Father, or than to the Divine Word, or Son dwelling (as they ſay) after a peculiar manner in Chriſt? But the matter is plain, the Holy Ghoſt is the Power of God, of which Chriſt ſtood in need, for performing the Will and Works of the Father, and which God beſtowed on him for that very end; but if Chriſt had been indeed God, there had been no need he ſhould receive any ſuch Gift; for as God he would have had it, *in his own Perſon.* Our Author adds, 'He might as well have 'aſked, why the Sanctification of the Church 'is aſcribed to the Spirit? But the Hiſtorian had no reaſon to ask ſuch a Queſtion: for no one pretends that the Church is God; or is Perſonally united either to the Father or Son, as *Trinitarians* ſay the Human Nature of Chriſt is.

It is after the ſame ſlight and inſignificant manner, that he anſwers the next Argument, even this; 'The Miracles of Chriſt are at-'tributed always, either to the Father, or the 'Holy Spirit dwelling in him. He anſwers (*pag.* 188.) *Father, Son and Holy Spirit act together.* I ſay now, ſuppoſing this which he ſays; yet if Chriſt were God, why ſhould we never aſcribe his Miracles to himſelf; why *always* to the Father, or to the Holy Spirit which is the Power of the Father? why has he concealed a matter of ſo great importance to be known? Or why do we ſeek to make him greater than he ever ſaid he was? Beſides,

ſides, in the very Texts, in which he aſcribes the Miracles he did, to the Father, or the Spirit and Power of the Father dwelling in him; I ſay in thoſe very Texts he denies, that he doth them himſelf: which is directly contrary to what our Author affirms, that the (pretended) three Divine Perſons have but one Energy, and act by one Individual Act. If that were ſo, our Saviour could not have ſaid, John 5. 30. *I can do nothing of my ſelf.* John 14. 10. *The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.* Let us hear the account which St. *Peter* gives, Acts 10. 38. *God anointed Jeſus of* Nazareth *with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppreſſed with the Devil: for God was with him.* Here St. *Peter* teaches, that Chriſt wrought all ſorts of Miracles, not becauſe (as *Trinitarians* ſay) he was God, but *becauſe God was with him*, i. e. God helped and aſſiſted him, by anointing him with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Power.

The next Argument is, ‘ Had our Lord ‘ Chriſt been more than a Man, the Prophe- ‘ cies of the Old Teſtament in which he is ‘ promiſed, would not deſcribe him barely ‘ as *the Seed of the Woman, the Seed of Abraham,* ‘ a Prophet like unto *Moſes*; the Servant and ‘ Miſſionary of God, on whom God's Spirit ‘ ſhould reſt. The Hiſtorian by a particular Induction of Texts, ſhews this to be the Character of Chriſt in the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament. Our Author thinks fit to anſwer this Objection, in another place.

I come now to his Anſwers, which he makes to the Arguments againſt the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt.

The Firſt Argument in the Hiſtory, is this; ‘ The Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, and the Power of ‘ God, are in Scripture ſpoken of as one ‘ and the ſame thing. Our Author anſwers, at *pag.* 189. ‘ It is as eaſy to prove, that the ‘ Father and Son are no Perſons, as that the ‘ Holy Spirit is none. But if he can make good this Aſſertion, *erit mihi magnus Apollo.* The Father has in the New Teſtament the Title of God, therefore becauſe God is moſt certainly a Perſon, no Body can doubt that the Father is a Perſon. As for the Son, the ſame Goſpel often ſays he is a Man; every Man being a Perſon; the Son being a Man, muſt be alſo a Perſon. But it is quite otherways with the Holy Ghoſt, for the Scriptures call it *the Power* of God; and Power is a Faculty, not a Perſon. Acts 10. 38. *God has anointed Jeſus of* Nazareth *with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Power.* Luke 1. 35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee.* What is more plain than that, *the Power of the Higheſt* in theſe Texts is the explication of *the Holy Ghoſt?* Again, Acts 6. 5. *They choſe* Stephen, *a Man full of Faith, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* Ver. 8. *And* Stephen *full of Faith and of POWER, did great Wonders.* Here again the Holy Ghoſt at *ver.* 5. is explained by Power at *ver.* 8.

He ſays further; ‘ He is the Spirit of God, ‘ which ſearcheth the deep things of God; ‘ and he who knows all things in God, muſt ‘ be a knowing Mind. In anſwer to this, I muſt explain the Text to which he alludes, 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. and which he cites too, *pag.* 192. Ver. 10. *But God has revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit ſearches all things, yea the deep things of God.* The Apoſtle ſpeaks here of *the Doctrines of the Goſpel*, its Precepts and Promiſes, which before were hidden, but now are revealed to Men; as appears by *ver.* 7, 8, 9. He meaneth this; ‘ God has ‘ revealed to us Apoſtles theſe Doctrines, ‘ this (formerly) hidden Wiſdom, *by his In-* ‘ *ſpiration*; for this Spirit or Inſpiration in us ‘ ſearcheth out (*i. e.* finds or diſcovers) theſe ‘ deep or hidden things of God. Deep, I ‘ ſay, and hidden; not to us, but to the ‘ World, and the Princes of the World. The Apoſtle illuſtrates his Diſcourſe with a Compariſon, ver. 11. *What Man knoweth the things of a Man, ſave the Spirit of a Man which is in him? Even ſo the Things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God.* As if he had ſaid, As *no Man* knows the things that belong to Human Life, but by his own Spirit or Mind: So *no Man* knows theſe things of God, but by God's Spirit or Inſpiration, whereby he is enabled to know them. This Interpre-

cation perfectly agrees with what follows, at ver. 12. *Now we have not received the Spirit of the World, but the Spirit of God, that we might know the things that are freely given us of God.*

This is the true Senſe of this place. For οὐδενὸς which we tranſlate *no Man*, muſt either be underſtood excluſively of God; or ſo as to include God alſo. If it includes God too, it will follow, that the Holy Spirit or Third Perſon of the Trinity, knows the Things of God, and that the Father and Son are altogether ignorant of them; which Conſequence, I am ſure, they will not allow. But if οὐδενὸς ſignifies *no Man* here (as moſt certainly it does) then *the Spirit of God* is to be underſtood of, *the Man who has received that Spirit or Inſpiration*; by aſſiſtance whereof he may attain to the knowledge of the moſt ſecret Counſels of God; as the Apoſtle explains it, in the very next Verſe. The Author grants, that Charity may be ſaid *to ſuffer long, and to be kind*, becauſe a charitable Man does ſo: then the Spirit of God may be ſaid *to know the Things of God*, becauſe ὁ πνευματικὸς, *He that is Spiritual* (as St. *Paul* ſtiles him, Ver. 15.) he that has the Spirit of God, does ſo. This *Vorſtius* rightly underſtood in his Notes upon this place. 'By *the Spirit of God* (ſaith he) *we* 'muſt underſtand *that Spirit which is given* 'us of God; that is, our Selves as Spiritual: 'thus (*John* 3. 6.) *That which is born of the* 'Spirit, ſaith our Saviour, *is Spirit*. This I hope may be enough to clear the ſenſe of this Text.

But the Author cannot allow of Power and Inſpiration, diſtinct from God, and yet not God; *for what are Faculties in us, are Perſons in God*. If this be true, then there are more than Three Perſons in the Godhead; for *Power* is a Faculty in us, and being in God too, it muſt be another Perſon in him. Thus not only Wiſdom and Love, but Power alſo are Perſons in God. Nay, there being Three knowing Minds in the Godhead, each of which is God, as the Author tells us; it cannot be ſaid, that the Father only has Wiſdom, Love, and Power. The Son and the Holy Ghoſt muſt have them too; elſe they ſhould not be God. But if Wiſdom, Love and Power, being Faculties in us, ought to be Perſons in God: then there are Nine Perſons at the leaſt, in God, *viz.* Wiſdom, Love and Power in the Father, who is an Infinite Mind diſtinct from the Son and Holy Ghoſt; Wiſdom, Love and Power in the Son, who is an Infinite Mind diſtinguiſhed from the Father and Holy Ghoſt; Wiſdom, Love and Power in the Holy Ghoſt, who is an Infinite Mind diſtinct from the Father and Son. Moreover, he tells us, that the Son is a Perſon, *becauſe He is the Father's Reflex knowledge*. But the Son being an Infinite and moſt Perfect Mind, is undoubtedly able to reflect upon his own Wiſdom and Knowledg, and thus (as well as the Father) to beget a Son. And this ſecond Son in the Trinity may by the ſame Means and Reaſon beget another, and ſo onwards to Infinity. Thus according to this Maxim, that *what are Faculties in us, are Perſons in God*; there may be, nay there muſt be, an infinite number of Perſons in God. *Apage!*

'This is certain (ſays he) all Perſonal 'Acts belong to a Perſon; and therefore 'whatever has any Perſonal Acts, we muſt 'conclude is a Perſon: unleſs we know by 'ſome other means, that it is no Perſon; 'and then, that proves the Expreſſion to be 'Figurative. But we know, that the Holy Ghoſt is no Perſon; and therefore we may affirm, that whenever Perſonal Acts are aſcribed to it, it is to be figuratively taken. That the Holy Ghoſt is not God, we moſt certainly know; becauſe the Scripture plainly tells us, there is but one God, *the Father*. That the Holy Ghoſt is not *a created* Perſon, is made probable by ſeveral places of Scripture, which teach us, that it is God's Power and Inſpiration; *by explaining the Holy Ghoſt by the Power of God*, and putting one for the other. According to theſe two Principles, which the Scripture affords us; *viz.* That the Father only is God, and that the Holy Ghoſt is God's Power; we dare affirm, that

when

when Personal Acts are ascribed to it, it is a Figurative Expression. Thus we can easily conceive, that the Holy Ghost may be said *to work Miracles* (pag. 190.) *to raise the Dead, to comfort, to convince, to sanctify the Church, to dwell in the Church:* because God by his Power works Miracles, raises the Dead, comforts, convinces, sanctifies, and dwells in the Church. Thus we do not *prove* that the Holy Ghost is no Person, *only because Personal Acts are sometimes Figuratively attributed to that which is no Person; as this Author mistakes:* But having proved by Scripture, that the Holy Ghost is no Person, we say that Personal Acts are figuratively ascribed to it, as they are to Charity, Wisdom, and other Things, both in Scripture and in Prophane Authors, and in common familiar Speech.

2. The second Argument, against the Spirit's being God, is this; 'A manifest Distinction is made, as between God and 'Christ; so also between God and the 'Holy Spirit, or Power and Inspiration of 'God: so that 'tis impossible, the Spirit 'should be God himself. To this our Author answers, *pag.* 191. 'This Holy Spirit is 'either a Divine subsisting Person, or nothing 'but a Name. If this Spirit were a Divine 'Virtue or Power (as he would have it) 'then it is not distinct from God, but is God 'himself: As the Powers and Faculties of 'the Mind, tho they may be distinguished 'from each other, yet they can't be any 'thing distinct from the Mind, but are the 'Mind it self; and therefore if the Spirit, 'as he says, be represented in Scripture, 'as so distinct from God, that 'tis impossible 'he should be God himself; then he must 'be a distinct Divine Person, and not the meer 'Power of God, which is not distinct from 'God himself. To this I answer; the Holy Spirit is neither a Divine subsisting Person, nor a meer Name. In order to the clearing of this, I must observe, that the Holy Ghost signifies in Scripture, sometimes the Power of God, sometimes the Effects of that Power, or all miraculous extraordinary Gifts. In the first sense, we read (*Luke* 1. 35.) *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall over-shadow thee.* Here it is evident that the Holy Ghost signifies the Power of God; whereby he effected the miraculous Conception of our Blessed Saviour. In the latter sense, we read (*Gal.* 3. 5.) *He therefore that ministreth to you the Spirit, and worketh Miracles among you; doth he it by the Works of the Law, or by the hearing of Faith?* Here the Spirit is plainly meant of the miraculous Gifts, bestowed upon the first Christians; and the meaning of the Apostle's Question is this; whether the *Galatians* had been indued with that Spirit, and those extraordinary Gifts, by submitting to the Ceremonial Law of *Moses*, or only upon their imbracing the Gospel? In the first sense, the Holy Ghost is only *an Attribute* of God, and so is *not a meer Name*; nor is it a Divine subsisting Person; which to say, were ridiculous, and contrary to the Notion of an Attribute. This Attribute may be distinguish'd from God, in such manner *as Attributes are wont to be distinguish'd*; that is, God may be said to act by his Power, as he is said to act by his Wisdom. But he saith, *If this Spirit were a Divine Virtue or Power, then it is not distinct from God, but is God himself.* I answer, if this be all our Author contends for, that the Holy Spirit (or Power) of God is God, in such sense as other Vertues and Faculties of God may be called God himself; the *Socinians* never denied it: and this is all that his Argument proves. Secondly, He ought to know, the Holy Spirit is not distinct from God, as one Person from another, but is distinguished from God *as his Attribute.* This is easy and plain, and agreeable to Reason and Scripture: and is a full answer to what he adds, in these words; 'A Power which 'is distinct from God, and is not God him-'self, as (he says) the Holy Spirit is, if it 'has any Personal Acts, must be a distinct 'Person: and if these Personal Acts are such, 'as are proper only to God, it must be a 'distinct Divine Person.

He

He goes on. 'He ſays this Spirit is the 'Inſpiration of God; be it ſo. This Inſpi-'ration then, is either within God himſelf; 'or without him, in his Creatures who 'have this Inſpiration. If it be within God 'himſelf, it muſt be a Perſon, or elſe it 'cannot be diſtinct from God; and a Divine 'Perſon, unleſs any thing be in God, which 'is not God. If this Inſpiration be with-'out God, in the Creatures who are inſpi-'red by him; how is it the Spirit of God? 'For the Spirit of God muſt be in God, 'as the Spirit of a Man is in a Man? I an-'ſwer.

If every thing that is in God be a Perſon, then there muſt be as many Perſons in the Godhead, as there are *Attributes* or *Immanent Acts* in God; which to ſay, is too ſenſleſs and ridiculous, to need Confutation. God's Inſpiration as 'tis an Act, is in God; as 'tis an Effect, 'tis in Creatures; and is called the Spirit of God, becauſe 'tis an Effect of that Spirit, Energy or Power, which God uſes to make his Will known to Men, by inward Suggeſtion or Inſpiration.

He deſires to know (*pag.* 192.) how the Spirit of God differs from his Gifts and Graces? I anſwer; As the cauſe from its effects: ſo that *there are Diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit*, 1 Cor. 12. 4. The ſame Cauſe produces ſeveral effects, out of the ſame Power ſpring ſeveral Gifts.

3. The next Argument is; 'The Spirit 'is obtained of God by our Prayers, there-'fore it ſelf is not God. This he pretends to anſwer by his Old Sophiſm, that One Divine Perſon may ſend and give another; which has been already confuted. He adds; 'The Spirit gives himſelf, and is asked of 'himſelf; for the Divine Perſons in the 'Trinity do not act ſeparately: but as the 'Father and the Son give the Spirit; ſo 'the Holy Spirit gives himſelf *in the ſame 'Individual Act*. But how can this be the ſame Individual Act? The Father and the Son, ſays he, ſend the Holy Ghoſt, and the Holy Ghoſt gives himſelf. Can *ſending another*, and *giving one's ſelf*, be one and the ſame Act? Farther; If the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt cannot act ſeparately, when the Holy Ghoſt gives himſelf, Father and Son muſt give themſelves too; or elſe it will not be *the ſame Individual Act*. But were it ſo; this would not be made peculiar to the Holy Ghoſt, who only is ſaid (in Scripture) to be given and obtained of God. But the thing is plain and eaſy, if by the Spirit we underſtand God's Power and Inſpiration; which (with their Effects) are communicated to thoſe that pray for them.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

4. THE next Argument is against a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead; 'Which (saith the Historian) is contrary 'to the whole Scripture. For that speaks 'of God, but *as one Person*; and speaks of 'him, and to him *by Singular Pronouns*; such 'as *I, Thou, Me, Him*, &c. He cites also *Heb.* 1. 2. where Christ is called, the express Image of God's Person. Our Author returns this Answer; 'It is plain that the Per'son, of whom the Son is called the express 'Image, is the Person of God the Father; 'and the Father indeed is but one Person. But here he takes for granted, that the Son is the second Person, of the Trinity; contrary to the Apostle, who speaks only of *the Person of God*, not of the Person of God the Father distinct from the Person of God the Son. If the Person, of whom the Son is here said to be the express Image, is only the Person of the Father; then the Person of the Father only, *at sundry Times and in divers Manners*, spake in times past to the Fathers by the Prophets, Ver. 1. for (Ver. 2.) the Son is called the Image of the same Person who spake to the Fathers at Ver. 1. But the Person of the Father only, is not the true God, in the Author's Hypothesis; therefore he must conclude, that the true God spake not to the Fathers: which is a plain Contradiction to the Apostle; who says, that God (undoubtedly the true God) spake to the Fathers. Farther, by *God who spake to the Fathers*, we must understand either Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or the Father only. If Father, Son, and Holy Ghost spake to the Fathers; it could not be here said, that Christ is the Image of that God's *Person*, for he is Three Persons. If the Father only spake to the Fathers, then *the Father only* is the true God; for the true God spake to the Fathers; also then God is but one Person: Which are the things we contend for.

He goes on; 'As for his *Singular Pro'nouns, I, Thou*, &c. They prove indeed 'that there is but one God; as we all own: 'not, that there are not Three Persons in 'the Godhead. But do not *Singular Pronouns* denote *Singular Persons*, in all Languages? When therefore they are applied to God, they show that he is a Singular (that is, but one) Person; unless they will say, that the Scripture is a particular Language different from all others: but this is false; for being written to Men, the Forms of speaking and the Senses of them, are the same as in all other Languages; and otherways the Scripture would not be given us, to instruct us, but to pervert and deceive us.

5. The fifth Argument. 'Had the Son 'or Holy Ghost been God; this would not 'have been omitted in the Apostles Creed. He answers; 'Had not the Son been God, 'and also the Holy Ghost, they would never 'have been put into the Apostles Creed; 'no more than the Form of Baptism, which 'is the Original of the Apostles Creed. But why not? Suppose the Son and Holy Ghost were not God; since *the Gospel was preached by the One, and confirmed by the Other*; why may not they be put into the Creed, as well as *the Catholic Church*, by whom *the Gospel is to be believed?* If our Creed only mentioned God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth; it would fit a Jew as well as a Christian: therefore a Christian Creed, *as such*, must make mention of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, tho' they are not Gods or God. A Christian, *as such*, must profess in his Creed, that he believes not only in God the Father Almighty; but also in his Son.

Son Jesus Christ, who was sent by him to preach the Gospel; and in the Holy Ghost, by which it pleased God to confirm the truth of it: By such a Belief he is distinguished from a Jew or any other Man.

He adds. 'That the Primitive Christians 'did believe the Divinity of the Son and 'Holy Ghost, we are sufficiently assured 'from all the *Antient Records* of their Faith; 'but there was *no Reason* to express this in *so 'short* a Creed, before the *Arian* and *Socinian* 'Heresies had disturbed the Church. 'Tis plain, our Author has not read the Records of which he speaks. And whereas he says, there was *no reason* to express the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Creed; 'tis very marvellous to me, that there should be no reason to express an Article, which he and his Party say *is necessary to Salvation*; and that a Man is no Christian that believes it not. But he saith it was not necessary in *so short* a Creed; but I say, had the Article been necessary, (or so much as true) the Apostles and Primitive Church would have inlarged their Creed, to make room for a necessary Article; an Article much more necessary than the *Holy Catholick Church*, and other Articles there expressed. Besides, what Inlargement would it have been, what Incumbrance to the Learner's Memory, to have added twice this single and short Word, *God*: *And in (God) the Son, Jesus Christ our Lord*, &c. *I believe in (God) the Holy Ghost*, &c. as *Trinitarians* express themselves now a days? It is plain therefore, that the Apostles and Antient Church could have no other Reason, why in their Creed they made no mention of the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost; no other, but that they believed it not. But why has our Author taken no notice of what the *Socinian* Historian had objected at *pag.* 22, 23, 24. was it too hot, or to heavy for him? Lastly; he says, *It needed not to be added; because the Son of God must be by Nature God; and the Spirit of God is as essentially God, as the Spirit of a Man is essential to a Man.* But must he that is the Son of God, be also by Nature God? St. *Luke* says of *Adam*, *who was the Son of God*, *Luke* 1. 38. Was *Adam* by nature God? Are not Angels in Scripture called *Sons of God*? and all good Christians are they not also Sons of God, in the Language of Scripture? *Job* 1. 6. and 38. 7. *John* 1. 12. 1 *John* 3. 2. For his other saying, that *the Spirit of God is as essentially God, as the Spirit of a Man is essential to a Man*: If one had leisure, there might be Answers enow made to it; all that I say, is, *I pray prove it.*

6. The Historian concludes, That, 'The '*Socinian* Faith is an accountable and reasonable Faith; but that of the *Trinitarians* is 'absurd, and contrary both to Reason, and 'to it self, and therefore not only false, but '*impossible*. On the contrary, our Author draws up against the *Socinian* System this Charge. '1. It ridicules the Scriptures. 2. It ridicules the whole Jewish Oeconomy. 3. It 'ridicules the Christian Religion. 4. It justifies, at least excuses, both *Pagan* and '*Popish* Idolatries. If it be so, my Masters, the *Socinians* are ill Men indeed: but let us do them this Common Right, to examine what Proof there is of this Indictment.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

1. THE First pretence is, That 'The 'Socinian Doctrine ridicules the 'Scripture, by putting either a very absurd 'or a very trifling Sense on it, unworthy of 'the Wisdom of God by whom it was in-'spired. He instances in some Expositions of Scripture, which he finds in the brief History of the *Unitarians*. For Example,

The Historian, in answer to *Psal.* 45. 6, 7. which the Apostle (at *Heb.* 1. 8.) applies to Christ, says, 'In the Hebrew and in the 'Greek 'tis, *God is thy Throne* (i. e. thy Seat, 'Resting-place, *Establishment*) *for ever*. Neither the Translation nor the Interpretation is the Historian's, but by him taken out of *Grotius*, whom no Man thinks to have ridicul'd the Scripture. But let us suppose, contrary to *Grotius*, that the Hebrew *Elohim* ought to be taken in the Vocative Case, thus; *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever:* Yet the Interpretation of *Grotius*, and of the Historian, affords neither an *absurd* nor a *trifling* Sense. The Words in the Psalms are (by confession of the ablest *Trinitarian* Interpreters) spoken of *Solomon*, and are applied or accommodated to Christ, by the Apostle: and I think 'tis very good Sense to say, that God was *the Resting-place, Seat, or Establishment*, both of Christ and *Solomon*. But (as I said) let us grant, that the Words should be thus rendered and interpreted, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever:* I draw from thence this Inference, If *Solomon*, tho but a Man, is here stiled God; then Christ, who is a greater Man, may be called so too. But when he is here called God, it is not meant that he is *the Supream God*, unless the Supream God can be said to be *anointed with the Oil of Gladness above his Fellows*, which is plainly inconsistent with the Notion of a Supream God. Besides, he who is called God in this place, is said to have *a God, by whom he is anointed*; which can by no means agree to the Supream God: for he can have no God above him, by whom he may be exalted, being himself the most High.

The Apostle in the following Verses, cites another Passage out of *Psal.* 102. 25, 26, 27. which (says our Author at *pag.* 201.) is a plain Testimony of the Divinity of our Saviour. The Words are these, *And thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth; and the Heavens are the works of thy Hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest, and they shall all wax old as does a Garment, and as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy Years fail not.* Now, I say, that the Creation of the World cannot be ascribed to Christ in this place. This, I prove, by the Scope of the Apostle in this whole Chapter, which is not to shew the Excellence which Christ has *of himself*, but that which he obtained by Donation, whereby he *was made* better than Angels, as appears by *ver.* 4. the Words are these, *Being MADE so much better than Angels, as he has by Inheritance obtained* (κεκληρονόμηκεν) *a more excellent Name than they.* The Greek Word which we translate *obtained by Inheritance*, signifies no more than barely *obtained*; the Words *by Inheritance* are useless and dangerous, and false too, for the Name Christ has obtained, came to him by free Donation, not by Inheritance. And therefore it is that the most Famous Criticks render κεκληρονόμηκεν, by *obtinuit, sortitus est*, he gained or obtained. I say therefore, the Apostle's Scope is to shew the Excellency that Christ obtained, not by Nature, or of Himself, but that which he had by Donation; and whereby he was made by God better than the Angels. Whereupon in this whole Chapter he opposes the Glory which Christ had been indued with,

to the Glory of Angels; and ſhews that His is more excellent and greater than Theirs. So that ſuppoſe Chriſt had indeed created the World, yet the Creation cannot be aſcribed to him in this Place; for if he had created the World, he ſhould have done it by a Power proper and eſſential to himſelf, not by a Power *received from another*. But the Apoſtle deſigns in this Chapter, not to ſpeak of what is natural or eſſential to Chriſt, but of what he has received from God, whereby he was *made greater* and more excellent than Angels.

Having thus ſhown, that Chriſt is not ſaid here to have created the World, I muſt now declare, in what Senſe this Text of the *Pſalm* is applied to him. The preceding Words, ſpoken of *Solomon*, are accommodated to him, to expreſs *the Glory and the Duration* of his Kingdom: its Glory, becauſe *God has anointed him with the Oil of Gladneſs above his Fellows*; its Duration, becauſe *his Throne is for ever and ever*. By which glorious and laſting Kingdom, Chriſt has been made much better than Angels, and obtained a more excellent Name than they: which (as I ſaid before) is the thing, the Apoſtle in this Chapter intended to teach us. Now to the ſame purpoſe he applies to Chriſt another place, taken out of *Pſal.* 102. and ſeparated from the other only by the Word *And*: by this other place (or rather, in the Words and Terms of this other place) he confirms what he ſaid before concerning the Duration of Chriſt's Kingdom; and ſhews that tho all things be ſubject to change and alteration, yet Chriſt's Kingdom ſhall be immutable and laſt for ever. *They* (the Heavens and the Earth) *ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt; and they all ſhall wax old as does a Garment, and as a Veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed; but thou art the ſame, and thy Years fail not.* Theſe Words are uſed as a Confirmation of what went before, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* As for ver. 10. *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth*, &c. The Apoſtle does not cite it as ſpoken of Chriſt, or with intention to accommodate it to him; but becauſe it was neceſſary for explaining the word, *They* (*They ſhall periſh*) in the following words, which he had occaſion to uſe for expreſſing *the Duration* of Chriſt's Kingdom. And now I appeal to any Reader, whether this be *an abſurd* Senſe? Is not this Explication clear, and agreeable to the Scope of the Sacred Writer? But is not the Senſe which the Author would put upon this place, both abſurd and inconſiſtent? Can it be ſaid that Chriſt is *made better* than Angels, and obtained a greater Name than they, becauſe he created Heaven and Earth; that is, being ſo before *by Nature*, and from all Eternity, he is afterwards *made better*, and has a more excellent Name than theirs *beſtowed* on him?

The next place he examines, is *Pſal.* 68. 18. *Thou haſt aſcended on high, thou haſt led Captivity Captive, thou haſt received Gifts for Men:* Which St. *Paul* applies to Chriſt. Whereupon our Author ſays, 'The ſingle Queſtion is, Whether Chriſt be that God of whom the Pſalmiſt ſays, that *He aſcended on High? &c.* If he be not, St. *Paul* has abuſed us, for he applies that to Chriſt, which was not ſaid of him. Here indeed is a very raſh Concluſion. Were this true, it would follow, that the Sacred Writers of the New Teſtament have abuſed us, as often as they have cited any place of the Old Teſtament *by way of accommodation*. Thus St. *Paul* has again abuſed us, when he applies (at *Rom.* 10. 18.) to the Apoſtles theſe Words, *Their ſound went out into all the Earth, and their Words into the ends of the World*; which every one knows and confeſſes are meant (at *Pſal.* 19. 4.) of the Heavens and other Works of God, which (as it were) preach his Wiſdom and Power and Goodneſs to all Nations. And thus St. *Matthew* (at *Mat.* 13. 35.) puts a Trick upon us, when he applies to Chriſt the Words of Pſal. 78. 2. *I will open my Mouth in Parables:* Which the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks of himſelf, not of Chriſt. Is our Author ſo little acquainted with the Writers of the New Teſtament, as to be ignorant, that they very often cite the Texts of the Old, not as Teſtimonies and Proofs of what they ſay, but by

way

way of Alluſion and Accommodation? Such is the place in queſtion, the Apoſtle thought fit to accommodate the words of the Pſalm, to the matter he was treating of; which was an elegant way of writing, and very much practiſed by the Antient Jews, as may be ſeen both in the Talmud and Rabbins. Let us hear *J. Calvin* on this place; 'Laſtly, ſays he, 'we muſt not be too ſcrupulous about the Li-'teral Senſe of this Pſalm; ſeeing the Apoſtle 'only alludes to the Pſalmiſt's words: even as 'he applies a place of *Moſes*, to the matter in 'hand at *Rom.* 10. 6.

'God himſelf can be no Type, ſays our 'Author, *pag.* 203. for the Type is always 'leſs perfect than the Anti-type; and there-'fore whatſoever is ſaid of God, muſt be-'long to his Perſon, and cannot belong to 'any other. But what then? We do not ſay that God is a Type of any other in this Text; nor did the Apoſtle cite the Words as ſuch: we only ſay, that what is ſpoken of God in the *Pſalm*, is by the Apoſtle applied to Chriſt by way of Accommodation; as ſeveral other Paſſages of the Old Teſtament are, both by him and other ſacred Writers; as is confeſt by all Interpreters.

The next Place is *Heb.* 1. 6. *When he bringeth the Firſt-begotten into the World, he ſays; and let all the Angels of God worſhip him:* Which laſt Words are commonly thought to be quoted out of *Pſal.* 97. 7. To this Allegation the Socinian Hiſtorian anſwers; 'The Apoſtle does not quote the Words of 'the Pſalmiſt, as if they were ſpoken of 'Chriſt; but only declareth the Decree of 'God (known to him by the Spirit) for 'ſubjecting the Angels to Chriſt, in the 'ſame Words that the *Pſalmiſt* had uſed on 'another Occaſion. This is a very ſound and judicious Anſwer; yet our Author cannot reſt ſatisfied with it, for he anſwers; 'But he proves this Decree of God by no 'other Revelation, but the Words of the 'Pſalmiſt, nor pretends any other; and if 'that don't prove it, we have no other. Yes, we have; for we know from Chriſt himſelf, that *all Power is given to him, both in Heaven and Earth*, and conſequently that he is exalted above all the Orders of Angels: this the Scriptures often teach, and it was believed by all Chriſtians in the time of the Apoſtles. So that when this ſacred Writer ſets before the *Hebrews* the eminent Glory of Chriſt; he does it, only to keep them in mind of it, and to perſwade them never to depart from the Doctrine of ſo great and glorious a Maſter. As if he ſhould have ſaid; 'You are not ignorant of the Glory 'Chriſt now injoys *in Heaven*; how Thrones, 'Powers, Dominions, *&c.* are ſubjected to 'him: for when God brought his Firſt-born 'and beloved Son into *the Heavenly World*, 'he ſaid concerning him, what had been 'ſaid upon another Occaſion, *Let all the 'Angels of God worſhip him*; let them honour, 'ſerve, and be ſubject to him. This is the true and natural Senſe of this Place; to which I muſt add, (what has been already obſerved by others) that it is probable this Place is quoted out of *Deut.* 32. 43. according to the Lxx; and not out of *Pſal.* 97. For there we find the very Words of the Apoſtle, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, *And let all the Angels of God worſhip him.* But in *Pſal.* 97. we find only, *Worſhip him all ye Gods.* If this be true, as I think it is, our Author's Objection will fall of it ſelf. For thoſe Words in *Deut.* are not ſpoken of God, but of God's People, the *Iſraelites.* And if this can be ſaid of God's People; I hope it may be ſaid of Chriſt too, without concluding from thence, that he is the Supream God.

The next Place is *Iſa.* 45. 23. *I have ſworn by my ſelf; Unto me every Knee ſhall bow.* Which Words of God are applied to Chriſt at *Rom.* 14. 10, 11. *We ſhall all ſtand before the Judgment Seat of Chriſt; for it is written, Every Knee ſhall bow to me, and every Tongue ſhall confeſs to God.* To this the Hiſtorian anſwers; 'In bowing and confeſſing to 'Chriſt at the laſt Judgment, we are ſaid 'to bow and confeſs to God; not becauſe 'Chriſt is God, but becauſe Chriſt then and 'there holds the place of God, repreſent-

'eth him, and acteth by his Commiſſion. 'So Men are ſaid to appear before our So'raign Lord the King, when they appear at 'the Bar of his Judges; becauſe the Judges 'act in the King's ſtead, and by his Com'miſſion. To this our Author replies; 'But why does he confine this bowing the 'Knee *to the laſt Judgment?* St. *Paul*, in'deed gives this as one Inſtance, but does 'not confine it to this; but in the Epiſtle 'to the *Philippians* makes it as large, as the 'Exaltation of our Saviour; *Wherefore God 'hath highly exalted him*, &c. And one may plainly ſee, that the Hiſtorian does not confine the bowing of the Knee *to the laſt Judgment*; He only explains the Words of the Apoſtle which relate to it. But what then? The Apoſtle makes the bowing of the Knee as large as Chriſt's Exaltation, *Phil.* 2. What follows from thence? That Chriſt is God! By no means. It follows only, that we ought to pay Chriſt an Honour proportionable to the Dignity beſtowed on him; in a word, that every Tongue confeſs that he is *Lord, to the Glory of God, the Father.* In which Words the Apoſtle plainly teaches us, that the Honour we pay to Chriſt, is ſubordinate to God, and deſigned to promote *God's* Glory.

'If then, ſays he, we muſt bow to the 'Perſon of Chriſt, and confeſs him to be 'the Lord, and this can be an Accompliſh'ment of God's Oath, *Unto me every Knee 'ſhall bow, and every Tongue ſhall ſwear*; then 'Chriſt is that God, who in the Prophet '*Iſaiah* ſwore, That every Knee ſhould bow 'to him. This is juſt as if one ſhould ſay; If then the Iriſh muſt bow to the Perſon of the *Vice-Roy* in *Ireland*, and confeſs him to be the Lord; and this be the Accompliſhment of the King's Will, *Unto me all the Iriſh ſhall bow, and ſwear Allegiance*; then the *Vice-Roy* is that King, who will have all the Iriſh to ſwear Allegiance to him. This is a ridiculous Argument; for as the Iriſh may bow to the Perſon of the *Vice-Roy*, and look upon him as *a Lord* eſtabliſhed by the King to govern *Ireland*; ſo this they do in compliance with the King's Will, and to ſhew thereby that they are his loyal and faithful Subjects: and he who bows to the *Vice-Roy*, may be ſaid to bow to the King; becauſe the *Vice-Roy* repreſents the King, and acts in his Name. So that it would be non-ſenſe to ſay, the *Vice-Roy* is King, becauſe they pay him that Honour. Let us apply this to Chriſt; we muſt bow to him, and confeſs him to be the *Lord*; and by ſo doing, God's Oath is accompliſhed, *Unto me every Knee ſhall bow*, &c. Does it follow from thence, that Chriſt is that God, who ſwore in the Prophet *Iſaiah?* Not at all; becauſe when we pay this Honour to Chriſt, it is, to obey God's Commands, and to acknowledg his Power and Authority over us. He who honours the Ambaſſador, honours him that ſent him; he who honours Chriſt God's Anointed, honours God who anointed him. In a word, He who bows to Chriſt thô a Man, bows to God alſo.

The next place, is *Rom.* 9. 33. *As it is written, Behold I lay in* Sion *a ſtumbling-Stone, and Rock of offence; and whoſoever believeth on him, ſhall not be aſhamed.* Part of theſe Words are taken from *Iſa.* 28. 16. and becauſe they are ſpoken of God in the Prophet, and applied to Chriſt by St. *Paul* and St. *Peter*, as ſeveral other Texts of the Old Teſtament are: They conclude, Chriſt muſt be that God, ſpoken of in the Prophet. But the Hiſtorian anſwers; that 'Neither *Peter*, 'nor *Paul*, cite the Words of the Prophet, 'as ſpoken of Chriſt; but *only as in ſome 'ſenſe applicable to him*, namely, becauſe Chriſt 'alſo was to many a Stone of ſtumbling. To this our Author replies, like a Man very little acquainted with Scripture: that 'This is nothing elſe, but to charge the 'Apoſtles with abuſing Scripture; and pro'ducing Proofs, which are no Proofs. This I have anſwered before. But he tells us, that 'Paul alledges this Prophecy to prove, 'that the Infidelity of the Jews, and the 'Offence they ſhould take at Chriſt, was 'foretold in Scripture. Here I muſt tell him, he is miſtaken. For the Words are

no

no ſuch Prophecy; but are ſpoken of the Times of *Sennacherib*, who was to make War againſt the Inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, whom God promiſes to protect and defend, if they will but keep within the Walls of the City, and ſtick cloſe to his Law. The Author adds a conſiderable Reflection; 'And thus theſe Men, rather than they will 'allow the Scripture proofs, that Chriſt is 'God, deſtroy all the Old Teſtament proofs 'of the Truth of Chriſtianity; and yet if 'ſuch Texts as theſe, muſt paſs only for 'Accommodations and Alluſions, I know 'not where they will find any proofs. Alas! I perceive the Author would be a very unfit Man to convert Jews. When I read firſt this Paſſage of his Book; I could not but wonder, how it came from a Chriſtian. He knows not where we may find any proofs of Chriſtianity, beſides thoſe of the Old Teſtament. Are then the Miracles of Chriſt, and of his Apoſtles, nothing? Is Chriſt's Reſurrection no Proof, or but a weak one, of his being ſent by God, and the truth of his Meſſage? Muſt we account as nothing, the Purity of the Goſpel, and its ſwift Propagation thrô the whole World? I always thought, with other Chriſtians, that theſe were invincible Arguments for the Truth of our Religion. So they are indeed, and by them we ought to convince the Jews: and then we are able to give them a reaſonable Account of all the Texts of the Old Teſtament, that are quoted in the New.

The firſt place in the New Teſtament, quoted by our Author, is *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations; Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* This the Author of the *Brief Hiſtory* explains, after this manner: 'To be Baptized in the Name of a Perſon 'or Perſons, is a Rite by which one delivers 'himſelf to the Inſtitution, Inſtruction, and 'Obedience of ſuch Perſon or Perſons. So 'that to be Baptized in the Name of the 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; is to pro'feſs to be led and guided by them: or '(as *Grotius* expreſſes this matter) 'tis to 'declare, we will admit of no other thing 'as a part of our Religion, but what pro'ceeds from theſe; that is, Nothing but 'what is *commanded by God*, or the Father, 'and has been *delivered by his Son* the Lord 'Chriſt, and *confirmed* (externally, by the 'Miracles; and internally, by the Witneſs 'and Teſtimony) *of the Spirit*, that is, of 'the Power and Inſpiration of God. Now all this our Author grants; only he ſays, that 'Baptiſm being a Religious Rite, it is 'a Religious Profeſſion of this; a Religious 'Devoting our ſelves to them: and there'fore we give up our ſelves to their Inſti'tution and Guidance, not as Creatures, but 'as to God; who is both the Author and 'Object of our Faith and Worſhip. But what is the meaning of all this? We do not deny, that Baptiſm is a Religious Rite, and a Religious Profeſſion of our Faith: we only deny that, becauſe we are Baptized in the Name of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, as well as in the Name of the Father, that therefore the Son and Holy Ghoſt, are Two Divine Perſons, and God as well as the Father. We religiouſly profeſs in Baptiſm, to believe no other Doctrine but what is derived from the Father, taught by his Son, and confirmed by the Holy Ghoſt; and the being Baptized in the Name of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, is ſo far from proving, that they are God; that ſuppoſing they are not, yet we muſt of neceſſity be Baptized in their Name. When the Apoſtles made Proſelytes, had they Baptized them only in the Name of the Father; ſuch a Baptiſm had been no diſtinction of Chriſtians from Jews; for the Jews believed in the true God, as well as the Chriſtians. So that ſuppoſing Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt are not God, yet ſince the Goſpel was firſt preached by the One, and confirmed by the Other; it was neceſſary that he who imbraced the Goſpel, ſhould be Baptized in the Name of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt: to profeſs thereby, that he was neither a Jew nor a Pagan, but a Chriſtian; and that he

he admitted no other Doctrine, but that delivered by the Son, and confirmed by the Holy Ghost. This was so essential to the Baptism of a Christian, that we never read in the *Acts of the Apostles*, that Prosolytes were baptized in the Name of the Father, but *only in the Name of the Son*: of which we can give a reasonable Account; for all that believed *in God*, did not believe in Christ; but whoever believed in Christ, believed in God too. One might believe and trust *in God*, without being a Christian; but whoever believed in Christ and was Baptized in his Name, was both a Worshipper of the true God, and a Christian. He who was Baptized in the Name of the Son, did publickly profess this Belief, that he was sent from God, and had his Doctrine from him; and by such an Acknowledgment he profest at the same time, that God bare testimony to this Doctrine by the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost: So that to be Baptized in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to be Baptized only in the Name of the Son; are one and the same thing. I shall conclude this, with the Words of the Learned Mr. *Limborck*, Theol. Christ. *pag.* 645. *Dominus Jesus ritui*, &c. In English thus; 'To this Rite before 'practised by *John Baptist*, the Lord Jesus 'added another Signification; *viz.* the Pro-'fession of his Name, and the Publick Re-'ception of the Doctrine he had preached. 'Therefore he ordered that Baptism should 'be administred *in the Name of the Father, the 'Son, and the Holy Ghost*, Mat. 28. 19. That 'those who should receive the Rite of Bap-'tism, might thereby give up themselves 'to the Father, the Son, and the Holy 'Ghost; and profess themselves Disciples of 'that Doctrine, which is originally derived 'from the Father, revealed and preached 'by the Son, and confirmed by the Holy 'Ghost, with divers Miracles, Signs, Pro-'digies, and Distributions of Gifts. So that 'the Reception of Baptism, was *a publick 'Profession of the Doctrine of Christ*: There-'fore it is, that the Faithful are said every 'where, to be *Baptized in the Name of Christ*; 'that is, to profess by their being Baptized, 'that they receive his Doctrine as Divine, 'and will be called by his Name, as being 'their heavenly Master and only Saviour.

The Historian adds, that, 'Tis in vain, 'not to say ridiculously pretended; that a 'Person or thing is God, because we are 'Baptized *unto it*, or *in the Name of it*. For 'then *Moses*, and St. *John Baptist* also, would 'be Gods. 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. *Our Fathers 'were all Baptized unto* Moses. Acts 19. 3. '*Unto what then were ye baptized? And they 'said, unto* John's *Baptism*; that is (say 'the Generality of Interpreters) *unto John*, 'and the Doctrine by him delivered. He replies *pag.* 212. 'I confess he had answered 'this Argument; could he have shewn us, 'that the Jews were baptized in the Name 'of God, and in the Name of *Moses, for 'that had joined* Moses *with God*, as our Sa-'viour joins the Son and Holy Ghost with 'the Father in the form of Baptism. But if the Jews were baptized in the Name of *Moses*; who can doubt, that they were baptized in the Name of God too; as those who are baptized in the Name of Jesus, are *thereby* baptized also in the Name of God, as has been before shewed? It is plain, the Apostle compares *Moses* with Christ; and tells the *Corinthians*, that, as they were baptized in the Name of Jesus the Son and Messenger of God, so the Fathers had been baptized in the Name of *Moses* the Servant of God. But we can afford the Author some places of Scripture, wherein *Creatures are joined with God*. Thus, *Exod.* 14. 31. it is said; *And the People feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his Servant* Moses. In the Hebrew 'tis, *in* the Lord and *in Moses* his Servant. Here *Moses the Man* is joined with God; and the Jews are said, to *believe in* him, as they believed *in* God. So 1 *Tim.* 5. 21. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels, that thou observe these things*, &c. Here elect Angels, tho Creatures, are ranked with God in so great and important a Matter, and act of

Religion,

Religion, as an *Obteſtation*. Again, *Rev.* 1. 4. *Grace be to you and Peace from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the ſeven Spirits which are before his Throne.* If *Moſes* and Angels may be joined with God, in Acts of *Faith*, of *Obteſtation*, and of *Benediction*; why not the Son and Spirit in *Baptiſm*, thô neither of them is God himſelf? We plainly ſee by St. *Paul*'s Words to the *Corinthians*, that to be baptized *in the Name of One*, does not import that he is God. 1 Cor. 1. 14, 15. *I thank God*, ſays he, *I baptized none of you, but* Criſpus *and* Gaius; *leſt any ſhould ſay, that I had baptized in my own Name.* He plainly intimates, that a meer Man may baptize in his own Name; and if any of the *Corinthians* had thought ſo of the Apoſtle, I hope they would not have concluded from thence, that he was God, or made himſelf God.

He adds; 'It is plain, that to baptize 'unto *Moſes*, is a Figurative and Alluſive 'Expreſſion; and does not and cannot ſig-'nify, that they were baptized in the Name 'of *Moſes*; becauſe it is not true. Indeed the Jews were not baptized as Chriſtians are; but ſtill they were baptized. Let the Author call it a Figurative and Myſtical Baptiſm, or what elſe he pleaſes; it was ſtill a Baptiſm, as St. *Paul* aſſures us. And to be baptized *into Moſes*, is the ſame with being baptized *in the Name of* Moſes; as in the New Teſtament to be baptized *into* or *unto* Chriſt, is the ſame with being baptized *in the Name of* Chriſt. This was rightly underſtood by *Voſſius*, who paraphraſes this place thus; *Scitis etiam*, &c. *i. e.* 'You know alſo, that they were all 'baptized in the Doctrine of *Moſes*, as the 'Meſſenger of God; as the Cloud, and the 'Paſſage thrô the Red-Sea were deſigned 'for a Confirmation of the Miniſtry of '*Moſes*.

But he denies, that, to be baptized *into* Chriſt, and baptized *in the Name of* Chriſt, ſignify the ſame thing. But he miſtakes as groſly, as he uſes to do; for any one may obſerve it, that compares the Texts, where theſe Phraſes are uſed. Thus, *John* 3. 18. *He that believeth on him* (in the Greek, εἰς *in*, or *into*, or *unto him*) *is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already; becauſe he hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God.* So at *Rom.* 6. 3. and *Gal.* 3. 27. to be baptized *into* Chriſt; and at *Acts* 2. 38. and 8. 16. to be baptized *in the Name of* Chriſt, are uſed as equivalent terms. Indeed, the plain meaning of *Rom.* 6. 3. is this; 'Know ye not, that 'ſo many of us as were baptized in the 'Name of Chriſt, and profeſt to obey his 'Doctrine, lay thereby under an Obliga-'tion of a Spiritual Conformity to his Death; 'in dying to Sin, as he is dead; and living 'to God, as he is raiſed from the dead 'and lives with God. So that the firſt words, contrary to our Author's Aſſertion, relate to the form of adminiſtring Baptiſm in the Name of Jeſus; and the latter to the effect of it. This we may apply alſo to *Gal.* 3. 27.

He further denies, That to be baptized *unto*, or *into* John's *Baptiſm*, ſignifies to be baptized in the Name of *John*: for (ſays he) *John* did not baptize in his own Name; but made Proſelytes to the *Meſſias*. But I hope he will not deny, that to be baptized *into Chriſt's Baptiſm* is all one with being baptized *in the Name of Chriſt*. And if this be ſo, to be baptized *into* John's *Baptiſm*, muſt alſo ſignify to be baptized *in the Name of* John. *John* indeed made Proſelytes to the *Meſſias*; but he preached the Doctrine of Repentance, and he who was baptized by him, was baptized into the Profeſſion of the Doctrine taught by him; and therefore, whoever profeſt in his Baptiſm, to follow the Doctrine of *John*, might be ſaid to be baptized to the Doctrine of *John*, or in the Name of *John*.

Laſtly, He asks, Whether it be not very abſurd, that the Power or Inſpiration of God, which is not a Perſon, ſhould be joined *in the ſame Form* with the Father and Son, who are Perſons? I anſwer; I ſee no abſurdity, in being baptized into the Profeſſion of

a

a Doctrine, which not only comes originally from God the Father, and is revealed by his Son, but is confirmed by the Power or Spirit of God.

The next and laſt Place of the New Teſtament, which our Auther conſiders, is the firſt Chapter of St. *John*'s *Goſpel*: Which, ſays he, *pag.* 215. gives a glorious Teſtimony to the Divinity of Chriſt; and a plain Demonſtration of the incurable Perverſeneſs of Hereticks. I will examine this High Pretence; and ſhew theſe three Things. 1. The Abſurdity of the Author's Explication of this Chapter. 2. The Inconſiſtency of the Trinitarian Hypotheſis with the Context. 3. The true ſenſe and meaning of this ſo much controverted Place.

1. The Hiſtorian ſaid, that the *Trinitarian* Expoſition of this Chapter is abſurd and contradictious, and that it is this; ' *In the Be-* ' *ginning*, i. e. from all Eternity. But, How (ſaith the Hiſtorian) can *in the Beginning*, be *from all Eternity?* From all Eternity is *before* the Beginning, or *without* Beginning, not *in* the Beginning. To this our Author replies, That *No Man expounds in the beginning of Eternity.* But he ſhould not be ſo bold in his Aſſertions; for Mr. *Calvin* expounds it ſo. He adds; ' When St. *John* tells us, *In the Beginning was* ' *the Word*; we ſay this proves the Eternity ' of the Word: for that which *was*, when ' all things began which had a beginning, was ' it ſelf before the beginning and without ' beginning. I anſwer, had the Evangeliſt deſigned to teach us the Eternity of the Word; he would undoubtedly have done it by the ſame Characters, that are uſed in Scripture to expreſs the Eternity of God. Now this Expreſſion, *in the Beginning*, is ſo far from denoting Eternity, that it is never applied to God in that Senſe. We read in Scripture, That *In the Beginning God created Heaven and Earth*, Gen. 1. 1. Heb. 1. 10. a plain Demonſtration that *In the beginning* cannot be applied to him that is God, but only to Creatures; and as plain a Demonſtration that God himſelf is from all Eternity; for he who created all things, muſt needs be (not only before all things, but) from Eternity. But we never read *God was in the Beginning*, in all the Deſcriptions which the Scriptures afford us of his Eternity: nay, they rather declare it or deſcribe it by, *Before the beginning*, Pſal. 90. 2. *Before the Mountains were brought forth*; ——*even from everlaſting to everlaſting thou art God.* Here Eternity is deſcribed by *before the beginning.* This is the Scripture-Notion of Eternity: therefore if St. *John* had intended to ſhew the Eternity of the Word, he ſhould not have ſaid *In the beginning was the Word*; but as 'tis ſaid of God, *In the beginning the Word created the Heaven and the Earth.* Nor will it avail any thing to ſay; ' The Word was ſo in the beginning; that *all things were* ' *made by him*; *and without him was not any* ' *thing made that was made.* For as the foregoing Words, *In the beginning was the Word*, are no true Deſcription of Eternity in Scripture; ſo neither are theſe, *All things were made by him, &c.* the Scripture-Deſcription of the Creation. There is no mention here made either of the Heaven, or the Earth, or the Sea, which are never omitted in the Deſcriptions we have in Scripture of the firſt and true Creation, a I ſhewed before; and therefore there is no need to inſiſt longer on this Phraſe in this place.

The Hiſtorian goes on. ' *Was the Word*, ' i. e. *was God the Son?* But where in Scrip- ' ture, ſays he, is the Word called God the ' the Son? Our Author replies: ' This *Word* ' indeed is God the Son; but we do not pa- ' raphraſe it ſo in this place, *In the beginning* ' *was God the Son*: but, *In the beginning was* ' *that Divine Perſon who is called the Word.* But I pray, what is the meaning of this? For if the Word is indeed God the Son, one may paraphraſe it here, In the beginning was God the Son; as well as, In the beginning was that Divine Perſon called the Word: the one is as fit, and as good Senſe as the other. But it ſeems, our Author is aſham'd to paraphraſe *the Word*, by *God the Son*: this is a Modeſty in him, which is but ſeldom found in his Book.

Hiſtor.

Hiſtor. ‘*The Word was God*, i. e. The ‘ Son was with the Father. *Anſw.* It ſeems ‘ then that God in this Clauſe, is the Father. ‘ But was not the Son alſo with the Holy ‘ Ghoſt, and is not he too (according to ‘ *Trinitarians*) God, or a God? If he is, why ‘ does St. *John* only ſay, the Son was with ‘ the Father; and how comes the Father to ‘ ingroſs here the Title of God, to the ex‘ cluſion of the Holy Ghoſt? To avoid the ſtrength of this Argument, our Author replies; ‘ By *God*, the Apoſtle here means ‘ that Original Mind and Wiſdom, that Su‘ pream and Soveraign Being, whom all ‘ Men called God, without making a Diſtin‘ ction of Perſons in the Godhead. But if *God* in this place does not ſignify the Father only, but the Three Perſons of the Trinity; he ſhould not tell us, that the Apoſtle here means that Original Mind and Wiſdom, but *thoſe Three Minds whom all Men called God*; for we are taught all over his Book, that God is Three infinite Minds; and conſequently Three Wiſdoms, for an infinite Mind cannot be without Wiſdom: Neither ſhould he ſay, *That Supream and Soveraign Being*, whom all Men call God, but thoſe Three Supream and Soveraign Beings: for he often tells us, that *God is Three infinite and ſubſtantial Beings*; therefore he is Three Supream and Soveraign Beings. It is a plain Contradiction, to ſay in one place, God is Three Minds and Three Beings; and in another, that he is but one Mind and one Being. Furthermore, when the Evangeliſt ſays, *The Word was with God*, if by God he means not the Father only, but the Three Perſons who are that God; this will make a very trifling ſenſe. For then, *the Word was with God*, muſt ſignify, the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity was with the Three Perſons of the Trinity, and conſequently with himſelf; which is not only trifling, but ridiculous.

The Apoſtle adds; *And the Word was God.* Our Author to ſerve his Hypotheſis, puts here another or a new ſenſe on the word *God*: for he ſaw it was inconſiſtent with his Opinion; that in this Clauſe *God* ſhould be interpreted, as it was in the foregoing. Indeed it would be ſtrange Non-ſenſe; for then *the Word was God* ſhould ſignify, the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity was with the Three Perſons of the Trinity. Therefore in his Hypotheſis, *the Word was God*, ſignifies, *the Word was a Divine Perſon in the Godhead, pag.* 216. But this Interpretation is no leſs abſurd than the other; for by *the Word*, he underſtands a Divine Perſon who is called *the Word*, and by *God* too he means a Divine Perſon in the Godhead. Therefore his Interpretation of theſe Words, *the Word was God*, amounts only to this, the Divine Perſon, who is called the Word, was a Divine Perſon.

But to give us a right and full underſtanding of this place, he thought fit to paraphraſe it thus; ‘ *In the Beginning was the* ‘ *Word, and the Word was with God, and the* ‘ *Word was God*; that is, In the Beginning ‘ of all Things was the Divine Perſon, whoſe ‘ Name and Character is *the Word*; this ‘ Word was inſeparably united to that Su‘ pream Being, whom we call God, and was ‘ himſelf God, a Divine Perſon ſubſiſting in ‘ the Unity of the Godhead; not a Power ‘ and Faculty as Reaſon is in Man. I hope the Author will not take it ill, if I paraphraſe his Paraphraſe, to make it clearer to vulgar Underſtandings. ‘ In the Begin‘ ning of all Things, was the ſecond Divine ‘ Perſon of the Trinity, whoſe Name and ‘ Character is the Word; this ſecond Di‘ vine Perſon of the Trinity was inſeparably ‘ united with the Three Perſons of the Tri‘ nity, whom we call God, and conſequent‘ ly with himſelf; and this ſecond Perſon ‘ was a Divine Perſon, not a Power and ‘ Faculty, as Reaſon is in Man. Our Author was ſo taken with this ſenſe of the Words of St. *John*, that he could not forbear breaking out into theſe Words, *Can any thing be more eaſy and obvious, and more agreeable to the Doctrine of the Trinity?* I confeſs, 'tis very agreeable to the Doctrine of the Trinity.

2. Thô I have ſhown already the inconſiſtency of the Trinitarian Hypotheſis, with

the First Chapter of St. *John's Goſpel*, by confuting the Author's Explication; yet I intend to make it appear farther, by theſe few Conſiderations: (1.) That *to be in the Beginning*, cannot here ſignify, to be from all Eternity, has been proved already; becauſe the Scripture does never deſcribe Eternity by ſuch an Expreſſion, nor does the Expreſſion *in its own Nature* denote Eternity: St. *John* would not have expreſſed ſo great a Myſtery, and ſo neceſſary to be believed by All, in improper and unſuitable Words. (2.) For the Word to be with God, and to be God, can never bear the ſenſe which the *Trinitarians* put upon it. When *John* ſays, *the Word was with God*; if by *God* we muſt underſtand the Three Perſons of the Trinity, and by *the Word* a Divine Perſon in that Trinity; this Interpretation makes, as I have ſhewed, this abſurd ſenſe; 'The ſecond Divine Perſon 'of the Trinity was with the Three Perſons 'of the Trinity, and conſequently with 'himſelf. But if by *God* we muſt underſtand *the Father* only; why does St. *John* omit the Holy Ghoſt, who is God as well as the Father, and with whom the Son was no leſs than with the Father? In a word (as the Hiſtorian ſpeaks) How comes the Father to ingroſs here the Title of *God*, to the excluſion of the Holy Ghoſt? (3.) *The Word was God*, muſt ſignify in this Hypotheſis; 'That Divine Perſon who is called the 'Word, was a Divine Perſon. (4.) All *Trinitarians* confeſs, that St. *John* in the Beginning of his *Goſpel*, ſpeaks of the New Creation wrought by the Goſpel, as well as of the Old; and thô they do not agree among themſelves about the place, where he begins to treat of this New Creation or Regeneration; yet they do all grant, that he diſcourſes of it before, Ver. 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh.* They all take thoſe words, *He came unto his own*, Ver. 11. to be meant of Chriſt's converſing among Men, and teaching them the way of Salvation. But if *the Word was made Fleſh*, at Ver. 14. ſignifies Chriſt's Incarnation, as *Trinitarians* pretend, it is unaccountable that St. *John*, writing the Hiſtory of Chriſt's Life, ſhould firſt tell us *what Chriſt Incarnate has done*, and then that *He was Incarnate.* This is juſt as if one, writing the Life of *Alexander*, ſhould ſay, he overcame *Darius*; and then, that he was begotten by *Philip* King of *Macedon.* Or, that Chriſt was tempted of the Devil; and then, that he was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt. Indeed it cannot be denied, that the Evangeliſts do not very much obſerve the order of time, in relating ſeveral Diſcourſes and Miracles of Chriſt; but this is of no great moment, and does not deſtroy *the proper and eſſential order of Hiſtory.* The former has been done by the Evangeliſts, as well as by other Hiſtorians; but never the latter. They never tell us, that Chriſt went about to preach the Goſpel; and then, that he was born: or that, he was raiſed from the dead; and then, that he died. This would be to invert the true order of Hiſtory, and make Non-ſenſe of it: And therefore it ſufficiently proves that theſe words, *The Word was made Fleſh*, coming after *He came unto his own*, cannot be meant of Chriſt's Incarnation. Thus Ver. 6, 7. *John* is ſaid to bear witneſs of Chriſt, and then that he was Incarnate. The like we may obſerve on Ver. 10. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him*; if thoſe Words, *The World was made by him*, are to be underſtood in a proper ſenſe of Creation, the Apoſtle ſhould have ſaid firſt, that the World *was made by him*, and then that *He was in the World.* (5.) This Evangeliſt plainly tells us (Chap. 20. Ver. 21.) the deſign he aimed at when he wrote his Goſpel; *Theſe Things are written, that ye might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have Life thrô his Name.* It was not therefore to teach the Divinity and Conſubſtantiality of Chriſt, as *Trinitarians* pretend. He wrote, that we might be ſure that Jeſus is the Chriſt, *the Son of God*, not that he was God. How comes he then to forget the moſt eſſential Thing, which induced him to write and publiſh

liſh his Goſpel, *viz.* the aſſerting of Chriſt's Divinity? No, no, it is plain, he only deſigned to teach and prove, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God. And the Son of God can no more be God, than a Son can be his Father. Thus I think it appears clearly, that this Beginning of St. *John*'s *Goſpel* does not favour the Trinitarian Opinion; but from Ver. 1, to Ver. 15. is only an Abridgment of his whole Book. Were the Trinitarian Hypotheſis clearly ſet down in other places of Scripture, I would not wonder to ſee Men lay ſo much ſtreſs upon this place: but ſince the Scriptures throughout teach us, that Chriſt was but a Man; it ſtands to reaſon, that we ſhould explain one obſcure place by a thouſand that are plain and eaſy.

3. I come now to aſſign the true Senſe of this famous Context.

Verſ. 1, 2. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: The ſame was in the beginning with God.*

PARAPHRASE.

'When Jeſus, who is called the Word, 'becauſe he was the Meſſenger and Preacher 'of God's Will and Word, and (as it were) 'the Mouth by which God pronounced his 'Oracles, *began* to preach the Goſpel; he 'was *intimate to the moſt ſecret Counſels of God*, 'like one who is in the very Boſom of his Fa'ther; and he was *in the form of God*, and 'like God, by reaſon of the Glory and Ma'jeſty that did ſhine in him.

1. That the *Man* Jeſus may be called *the Word*, or the Word of God, no Body will deny who reads *Rev.* 19. 13. where Jeſus is thus deſcribed; *He was clothed with a Veſture dipt in Blood, and his Name is called The Word of God.* He who is here called *the Word of God*, who is clothed with a Veſture *dipt in Blood*, muſt be *the Man* Jeſus. Our Lord calls himſelf *the Way*, becauſe he teaches us the way to Salvation; and *the Light*, in this very Chapter, becauſe he is the bringer of it: therefore why not alſo *the Word of God*, becauſe he was the Revealer, Bringer, and firſt Preacher of it?

2. It appears by the ſecond Verſe, that the Evangeliſt did not deſign to make a real Diſtinction, between *to be in the beginning*, and *to be with God*; for what was diſtinctly ſpoken in the firſt Verſe, is put together in the ſecond, thus, *The ſame was in the beginning with God.* In effect, the meaning of the Apoſtle is not, that Chriſt was, when he began to enter upon his Prophetick Office; this would be no great wonder: but that, when he began to preach the Doctrine of the Goſpel, he was admitted into the moſt intimate Counſels of God, or made partaker of his moſt ſecret Will. This I think to be the reaſon of the Repetition contained in the ſecond Verſe; beſides that we may obſerve, that Repetitions are very frequent throughout the whole Goſpel of St. *John*, and more uſed in that Book than in any other of the New Teſtament. Thus when the ſame Apoſtle ſays, 1 John 1. 1. *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, &c.* he does not pretend really to diſtinguiſh thoſe two things, and to ſay that the Goſpel was in the beginning of the Goſpel; but that what he had ſeen and heard of the Goſpel from the beginning of it, that he declared unto Men.

3. I have proved before, that *In the beginning* cannot ſignify the beginning of the World: but that it is here uſed for the beginning of the Goſpel, the place laſt quoted (and ſeveral others) do ſufficiently prove.

4. *To be with God*, and *to be in the Boſom of the Father* (at ver. 18.) are equivalent Terms. If therefore we know the true Senſe of the latter Expreſſion, we ſhall have a right underſtanding of the former. The Words at *ver.* 18. run thus; *No Man hath ſeen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the Boſom of the Father, he has declared him.* Now to ſee God in St. *John*'s Stile, is to know the Decrees and Will of God concerning the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel. Thoſe words therefore ought to be thus paraphraſed; 'No Man knew at

'any time the Will and Decrees of God, 'concerning the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel: 'the beloved Son of God, who was admitted 'into his moſt ſecret Counſels, has fully diſ-'covered them to us. The Word *Only-begotten*, is put here for *Beloved*, by way of Excellence; and ſo it is uſed very often, both in Profane and Sacred Authors. And to be *in the Boſom of the Father*, is not here an Interpretation of *Only-begotten* (that is, Beſt-Beloved) but it is brought in as the reaſon of the full knowledg that Chriſt had of God's Will, and of the diſcovery he made of it. Chriſt, ſaith our Evangeliſt here, has fully declared the Will and Counſels of God to us. How ſo? Becauſe he was intimate and admitted to the moſt ſecret and hidden Counſels of God; which he expreſſes by the Son's being *in the Boſom* of the Father. This is then the true Senſe of this Phraſe, *The Word was with God, viz.* God diſcovered to him the whole extent of his Will, he kept nothing ſecret from him, he filled him up with the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledg.

5. We may eaſily underſtand the true meaning of *the Word was God*, if we compare them with *Phil.* 2. 6. where Chriſt is ſaid to be *in the form of God*, and *equal with God*, or rather *like God*, as ἴσα θεῷ ought to be rendred. Chriſt was in the form of God, and like God; by reaſon of the Power and Authority beſtowed upon him, whereby he wrought all ſorts of Miracles; raiſing the Dead, curing the Lame, reſtoring ſight to the Blind, ſtilling the Winds and the Sea, *&c.* This we may apply to the words of St. *John*. Jeſus was not only in the Boſom of God, Partaker of his moſt ſecret Counſels; but he was beſides inveſted with ſuch Authority and Power, as made him like God. So that Chriſt is by St. *John* called *God* (or rather, *a* God) by reaſon of that Power and Authority, whereby he became in ſome manner like unto the true and moſt High God. But this Appellation does no more prove him to be the *true and moſt High God*, than *Solomon*, or the Judges, in the *Pſalms*, will be *the True God*, becauſe this Name *God* is given to them, *Pſal.* 82. 6. and 45. 6.

Ver. 3. *All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

PARAPHRASE.

'All things, neceſſary to the Propagati-'on of the Goſpel, were *performed* by him, 'the Author and firſt Preacher of it. And 'without his Direction, there was not any 'thing *performed* that was *performed*. That this relates not to the Creation of the World, but to the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel, is very plain from the following words, *In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men*, &c. In theſe words the Evangeliſt teaches us, how all things were *made* by Chriſt, becauſe in him was the Life and Light of Men; which all Men may diſcern, to be ſpoken of the Goſpel by him taught; which is the Light of Men and their Life, as it leads them to Eternal Life.

Ver. 10, 11. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not.*

PARAPHRASE.

'He was converſing *among Men*, to teach 'them the way to Salvation; ſome of them 'were *reclaimed* by him, but *the greater part* 'rejected him. He was ſent to his own Bre-'thren, but moſt of them would not re-'ceive him. It does ſufficiently appear by theſe words, *and the World knew him not*, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks only of Men, who only are capable of knowing; not of this viſible World: As indeed the 11*th* Verſe is a plain Explication of Verſe 10. St. *John* expreſſes in this Chapter the ſame thing ſeveral ways: *He was in the World*; *He came unto his own*; *The Light ſhined in Darkneſs*; theſe are equivalent Expreſſions. So alſo, *The World knew him not*; *His own received him not*; *the Darkneſs comprehended it not*; ſig-

nify

nify one and the ſame thing. Thus, *the World was made by him*, is explained at Ver. 12. thus, *But as many as received him, to them gave he Power to become the Sons of God*; and by Verſe 4, and 9. So that in all this, there was no Intention to ſay that the Old Creation was the work of Jeſus Chriſt.

CHAP. VIII.

HIS ſecond Charge is, That Socinianiſm makes the Jewiſh Oeconomy very unreaſonable and unaccountable, *pag.* 231. becauſe if Chriſt were no more than a meer Man, the Anti-type ſhould fall very ſhort of the Types contained in the Old Teſtament. 'The Tabernacle and Temple, 'ſays he, was God's Houſe where he choſe 'to dwell by the viſible Symbols of his 'Preſence; and was ſo contrived, as to be 'the Figure both of Heaven and Earth; for 'ſo the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* expreſly tells 'us, the Holy of Holies was a Figure of 'Heaven. —— But we muſt all confeſs, 'that this was a very unaccountable and in'ſignificant Ceremony, for God, who fills 'Heaven and Earth with his Preſence, to 'dwell in an Houſe made with Hands, — had 'it not prefigured ſomething more Divine 'and Myſterious. —— The Temple then 'was a Figure, and we muſt inquire, what 'it was the Figure of? Now a Typical Pre'ſence can be a Figure of nothing but a real 'Preſence, and God's Perſonal dwelling a'mong Men: for Preſence and Habitation 'can ſignify nothing but Preſence, and a 'Figure muſt be a Figure of ſome thing 'that is real; and nothing can anſwer to a 'figurative viſible Preſence of God, but a 'perſonal viſible Preſence. He goes on, and applies this to Chriſt, who (at *John* 2. 19.) calls his Body a Temple; which (ſays our Author) was that in Truth and Reality, which the Temple was but a Figure of, that is, *God's Preſence on Earth*, which he explains of his being perſonally united to Chriſt's Humane Nature. 'But if Chriſt 'be not Incarnate, adds he, if the Divine 'Word be not perſonally united to the 'Humane Nature; the Body of Chriſt is 'but a figurative Temple, as the Temple 'at *Jeruſalem* was: and then one Figure is 'made a Type of another; which is as 'great an Abſurdity in Types, as a Metaphor 'of a Metaphor in ſpeech. I do not remember I ever ſaw ſo much trifling, ſo ſeriouſly urged in a weighty Queſtion: but I have undertaken the drudgery of making Reflections on it; and therefore will conſider what he has offered. ——

1. That the Temple was a Figure both of Heaven and Earth, I am content to admit; the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* may be interpreted to that purpoſe. But that it was alſo a Type of Chriſt's Body, we have no colour from Scripture to affirm it; and the Author has offer'd no other ground for it, but his own wandring Fancy.

The Author to the *Hebrews*, who inlarges upon the Temple, does not give the leaſt Intimation of this: why then ſhould we contrive Types and Figures of our own, without any reaſon for it? If this be allowed, we may make Types of any thing; and increaſe Figures to an infinite Number. If the Author is in love with cold and groundleſs Allegories, every Body is not of his Mind, and therefore he ſhould keep them to himſelf. But why ſhould the Temple be a Figure of Chriſt's Body, rather than the Ark? God is ſaid, all over the Old Teſtament, to dwell between the Cherubims; it was the proper Seat of God, where he gave forth his Oracles, and made his *Glory* to appear

by

by affording ſenſible Signs of his Preſence. If therefore ſuch Allegories had any Signification of future Times and Things, it would be more probable that the Ark was a Type of Chriſt's Body, than the Temple: the rather, becauſe we know already by a Divine Teſtimony, that the Temple was a Figure of ſome-thing elſe. But he will ſay, that Chriſt calls his Body a Temple. What then? ſo St. *Paul* calls the Corinthians; Ye are, ſays he, *the Temple of God*. Was the Temple at *Jeruſalem* a Figure or Type of the Bodies of the Corinthians? Or does our Saviour ſay, that he calls his Body a Temple, becauſe it was the Anti-type of the Temple of the Jews?

2. Thô the Temple were not a Figure of Chriſt's Body, yet it would be no unaccountable and inſignificant Ceremony, for God to dwell in an Houſe made with Hands; to appoint this the place of his Worſhip, *&c.* which our Author thinks to be inexplicable without admitting his Doctrine of the Trinity. Who knows not, that the *Iſraelites* were given to Idolatry; and that the pompous way of Worſhip uſed among the neighbouring Nations, agreed ſo much to their Fancies, that it was neceſſary to comply with them in this thing, that they might be kept from worſhipping other Gods, and the current of Idolatry be reſtrained. Thus God in his infinite Wiſdom thought fit to ſet up among his People a carnal and ſenſible Worſhip; and to appoint an Houſe where he would dwell after a particular Manner, and afford viſible Symbols of his Preſence. All this he did to accommodate himſelf to the groſs genius of the *Iſraelites*, and to perſwade them to forſake Idols, and to acknowledg no other God but himſelf. This was the true reaſon of the Temple, of God's dwelling there, and the Glory with which it was ſometimes filled: and to affirm that all was done, to prefigure Chriſt's Body, is a Fancy which the Author might better have kept to himſelf.

3. But ſuppoſe the Temple was a Type of Chriſt's Body; yet there is no need God ſhould be incarnate in Chriſt's Body, to anſwer that Type. The Scriptures tell us, God was *with* Chriſt, and *in* Chriſt; which I hope might be done without an Incarnation or Perſonal Union, as he was in the Temple. As God ſpake in the Temple, ſo he ſpake *in* and *by* Chriſt. But beſides all this, Chriſt was *greater than the Temple*; becauſe God was *always* preſent with him, which cannot be ſaid of the Temple, where the Signs of God's Preſence were not always viſible. God's Dwelling in Chriſt was always conſpicuous by the Oracles which he delivered, and the Miracles he wrought.

But he objects a place of Scripture. 'To 'this, ſays he, St. *John* plainly alludes; '*The Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt amongſt* '*us, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of* '*the only-begotten of the Father, full of Grace* '*and Truth.* Ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, *tabernacled a*'mongſt us; fulfilled that Type of God's 'dwelling in the Tabernacle and Temple at '*Jeruſalem*, by his dwelling Perſonally in 'Humane Nature.

This Argument, or rather Congruity, is grounded on two falſe Suppoſitions. The firſt is, that *The Word was made Fleſh*, is meant of Chriſt's Incarnation. The ſecond, that in theſe Words, ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, which we render *he dwelt amongſt us*; St. *John* alludes to God's dwelling in the Tabernacle. I begin with the firſt. It cannot be denied that ἐγένετο may be rendred *was*, as well as *was made*. Thus it is taken, *Luke* 1. 5. and 24. 19. and even at Verſe 6. of this Chapter. Nor can it be doubted that the word *Fleſh* ſignifies not only *Humane Nature*; but very often Humane Nature *as ſubject to Infirmities and Afflictions*. Now is it not more agreeable to Reaſon and Scripture, to interpret theſe words thus; 'And the Word (Jeſus) *was* a Man like 'unto us in all things, Sin excepted; having 'the ſame Mortal Nature, being expoſed to 'the ſame Miſeries and Afflictions: than to ſay, *The Word was Incarnate*, which is a Language unknown to Scripture; wherein we never find, that God made himſelf Man; and

and altogether repugnant to Reaſon? And this I confirm by *Heb.* 2. 14. *Foraſmuch then as the Children are Partakers of Fleſh and Blood; He likewiſe himſelf took part of the ſame, that thrô Death he might deſtroy him that had the Power of Death, that is the Devil.* Here Chriſt is ſaid to be Partaker of Fleſh and Blood, as pious Men are; which cannot be meant in a ſenſe of Incarnation, for pious Men are not ſaid to be Incarnate: but the one and the other are Partakers of Fleſh and Blood, that is, of Infirmities and Sufferings. This he explains farther at Verſe 17. *Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his Brethren:* but his Brethren were not Incarnate. But at Ver. 10, and 18. he expreſly expounds this of Chriſt's Sufferings: Ver. 10. *It became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, to make the Captain of their Salvation, perfect through Sufferings.* Ver. 18. *For in that he himſelf hath ſuffered, — he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted.* Mr. *Limborck* ſaw and confeſſed this that I have been ſaying; his Words are theſe, *Theol. Chriſt. pag.* 226. 'The true ſenſe of this place, is, that *the Word* 'was Fleſh: That is, a true fleſhly Subſtance, 'ſubject to all the Infirmities that attend our 'Fleſh; that is to ſay, He was Mortal, Vile 'and Contemptible. Which appeared more 'eſpecially in the days of his Paſſion and of 'his Death, which are called at *Heb.* 5. 7. '*The days of his Fleſh.*

2. Our Author, charmed with Allegories and myſterious Interpretations, has found out, that St. *John* alludes here to God's dwelling in the Tabernacle; and this he thinks God did, to make the Anti-type anſwer the Type, Chriſt's Body to the Tabernacle or Temple. Since he is ſo much in love with Allegories, it may be I may do him a kindneſs to help him to one, which I have ready at hand; it is this: As the Tabernacle in the Wilderneſs had no fixed place to ſtand in, as the Temple afterwards had, but was carried from one place to another; according to the ſeveral Incampments of the *Iſraelites:* So Chriſt, to fulfil that Type, was always wandring with his Diſciples, having *no where to lay his Head*, Mat. 8. 20. This Allegory is as probable, and more natural than his; without ſuppoſing an impoſſible Incarnation. I cannot tell, whether the Author will like it better than his own; I am ſure, I like neither of them. No, no, there is no Myſtery in the Greek Word: Our *Verſion* renders it well, *He dwelt among us:* So does *Seb. Caſtalio, Et apud nos, Gratiæ Veritatiſq; plenus, habitavit; And he full of Grace and Truth dwelt among us.* And the ſame word is thus uſed without any Myſtery, *Rev.* 12. 12. and 13. 6. where it is applied to the Inhabitants of Heaven. By way of concluſion, I will ſet down the ſenſe of the whole Verſe, which is an Abridgment of the Life of Chriſt: 'The Word was Fleſh, a mortal Man, ob'noxious to Sufferings and Death: here is 'his Prieſtly Office. *He dwelt among us full* 'of Grace and Truth; here is his Prophetic 'Office. *We have ſeen his Glory*; here is his 'Kingly Office. Thus therefore we ought to paraphraſe the whole; 'Jeſus Chriſt was 'a Mortal Man, Partaker of Fleſh and Blood, 'ſubject to the ſame Infirmities that we are; 'in a word, like unto us in all things, but Sin. 'And he dwelt among us, preaching the hap'py News of Reconciliation with God, and 'the Doctrine and Truth revealed to him by 'the Father. But thô he were a Mortal 'Man, a Man of Sufferings and Griefs; yet 'we have ſeen his Glory, ſhining in his Mi'racles, his Tranſfiguration, his Reſurrecti'on, his Aſcenſion into Heaven, *&c.* Such a 'Glory as was well becoming *the beloved* Son 'of God.

Having ſpoken of the Temple, he comes to diſcourſe of Sacrifices, and tells us; 'The 'true meaning of *the Lamb ſlain from the Foun'dation of the World*, is not meerly that he was 'ſlain *in God's Decree*; for what God has de'creed to be done, is not therefore ſaid to be 'done, before it is done. But this Lamb was 'ſlain in Types and Figures, from the Foun'dation of the World; ever ſince the fall of 'Adam, in thoſe early Sacrifices which were 'offered after the Fall, which were Typical 'of the Sacrifice of Chriſt. But, 1. Where has

has he found, that thoſe early Sacrifices were Typical of the Sacrifice of Chriſt? The Scripture is ſilent about it; and the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews*, who inlarges on the Sacrifices of the *Moſaical Law*, does not ſo much as mention thoſe that were offer'd before; which is unaccountable, if they were Figures of the Sacrifice of Chriſt. 2. But he ſays; 'He 'knows no Principle of natural Reaſon, that 'teaches us to offer the Blood of Beaſts to 'God; and therefore he muſt think, the 'Sacrifices of Beaſts to be an Inſtitution. But ſuppoſe thoſe early Sacrifices were an Inſtitution, does it follow from thence, that they were inſtituted to be Types of the Sacrifice of Chriſt? By no means: God might have other Reaſons for ſuch an Appointment. But ſince the Scripture does not mention the appointing of thoſe Sacrifices; we have good reaſon to believe, that they were of Humane Inſtitution: for had God appointed them, it would not (it ſhould ſeem) have been omitted in Scripture. 'Tis reaſonable to think, that *Abel* and *Cain* thought fit to offer Sacrifices and Oblations to God; to ſhew by ſuch viſible Marks, the Senſe they had of God's Majeſty; and to expreſs the Reverence they ought to pay to him. 3. To deny, that the Lamb was ſlain from the Foundation of the World meerly in God's Decree, *becauſe what God has decreed to be done, is not therefore ſaid to be done before it is done*, is no very accurate reaſoning in a Divine; becauſe 'tis contrary to the ſtile of Scripture. Is there any thing more uſual with the ſacred Writers, eſpecially with the Prophets, than to ſpeak of things to come, as if they were come to paſs already, by reaſon of their certainty and the immutable Decree of God? And why then cannot the Lamb be ſaid to be ſlain from the beginning of the World, meerly becauſe God had certainly decreed it ſhould be ſo? 4. But if he is not ſatisfied with this Explication, here is another for him. There is a *Tranſpoſition* in the words of this Verſe, which alſo may be obſerved in many other Texts of Scripture; ſo that the Verſe may be read thus, *Whoſe Names are not written from the Foundation of the World, in the Book of Life, of the Lamb ſlain.* This reading is confirmed by Chap. 17. Ver. 8. *Whoſe Names are not written in the Book of Life, from the Foundation of the World.* So the ſenſe of the controverted Text, is; 'The Names of thoſe who worſhip the 'Dragon were never written in the Book of 'Life of the ſlain Lamb; that is, in the Book 'of the Martyrs and Confeſſors of Chriſt, who 'were deſtined to eternal Life from the 'Foundations of the World.

Pag. 237. 'He deſires ſome of the learned Reaſoning *Socinians*, honeſtly to tell 'him; what account they can give of the 'Jewiſh Prieſthood and Sacrifices, which is '*becoming God.* Why ſhould God be propitiated by a Man, ſubject to the ſame Sins 'and Infirmities, and very often guilty of 'them, that other Men are? Why innocent 'Beaſts muſt die, to expiate the Sins of 'Men? The thing he aims at, is to prove that the *Socinian* Doctrine ridicules the *Jewiſh* Oeconomy. How ſo? The *Jews* Sacrifices, ſays he, were Typical of Chriſt's Sacrifice. We grant it; for ſo the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* intimates: we ſay only, that this was not the chief and primary end for which they were inſtituted. But what then? The Death of Chriſt was therefore a Sacrifice. So it was. Then he was not a Metaphorical Prieſt. No more he was. Then he was the Divine Word Incarnate. How ſo? This he ſhould prove, but he takes it for granted. I want the Author's Spectacles, how to draw this Conſequence, *therefore the Socinian Doctrine ridicules the Jewiſh Oeconomy*, from that Argument. Now to this Queſtion, concerning the Jewiſh Prieſthood and Sacrifices, I anſwer with St. *Paul*, Gal. 3. 19. *The Law* (the Ceremonial Law, the Law of Sacrifices and other external Rites) *was added becauſe of Tranſgreſſions*: i.e. by reaſon of the Idolatry of the *Iſraelites*, which could not be reſtrained but by ſuch a Method. Had not the *Jews* been inclined ſo much to Idolatry, by ſeeing the Worſhip of their Neighbours round them; God would not have put on their Necks this *Yoke*, *which* (as St. *Peter* ſays) *they were not able to bear.*

God

God himſelf ſays this, Jer. 7. 22. *I ſpake not unto your Fathers nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the Land of* Egypt, *concerning Burnt-Offerings or Sacrifices: But this thing commanded I them, ſaying, Obey my Voice, and I will be your God, and ye ſhall be my People.* Here we may plainly ſee, that God at firſt required nothing from his People, but to own him, and obey his reaſonable Laws, the Moral and Political Laws he deſigned for them: but he was, as it were, conſtrained to inſtitute Sacrifices, and other external and pompous Rites, by their Idolatrous Inclination. I refer our Author, about this matter, to Learned Dr. *Spencer*, the beſt Writer on the Ceremonial Law. This then is the true and primary Reaſon of God's appointing Sacrifices; and very well *becoming both* his Wiſdom and Goodneſs. And it hinders not, but thoſe Sacrifices might be alſo Typical of the Sacrifice of Chriſt: they were ſo, ſecondarily. God who appointed Sacrifices to ſtop the progreſs of Idolatry, did alſo by them prefigure the Sacrifice of Chriſt. *But a meer Man*, ſays he, *can be no more than a Metaphorical and Typical Prieſt and Sacrifice.* This, I think, deſerved to be proved. A Metaphorical or Typical Prieſt and Sacrifice are here oppoſed to a true Prieſt and Sacrifice; yet he tells us, that *tho the Prieſts and Sacrifices of the Law were Typical, they were true and proper Prieſts and Sacrifices; and made a true and proper expiation for Sin, as far as they reached.* But if the Prieſts of the Law were true and proper Prieſts, and the Sacrifices true and proper Sacrifices; much more will the Sacrifice of Chriſt be a true and proper Sacrifice, tho he alſo was a Man. This Conſequence the Author himſelf has afforded us. Now becauſe the Anti-Type, as he ſays, ought to be greater than the Type; what remains, is only to inquire, Whether Chriſt be a more excellent Prieſt and Sacrifice, than the Prieſts and Sacrifices of the Law? The Prieſts of the Law were but ordinary Men, diſtinguiſhed from others only by the Dignity of their Prieſthood: but Chriſt was the *Meſſias*, the Son of God, intruſted with his ſecret Will, indued with an immenſe Authority and Power, and made (as it were) God by the unſpeakable Gifts of God his Father. The Prieſts of the Law were called to their Prieſt-hood in an ordinary way; but Chriſt by God's immediate appointment. The High-Prieſts of the Law entred only into a Tabernacle made with Hands, and but once a Year into the *moſt Holy* Place; but Chriſt into a Tabernacle whoſe Builder and Maker is God, and is to continue there for ever. Surely therefore, tho he is a Man only, this Anti-Type is more excellent than the Types, and Chriſt a more excellent High-Prieſt and Sacrifice than thoſe of the Law. So that here is no ridiculing the Jewiſh Oeconomy, by the *Socinian* Hypotheſis: but our Author by ſuch ungrounded Charges, and weak Proofs, has written a Book very fit to confirm *Socinians* in their Opinions.

CHAP. IX.

III. HIS Third Charge is, *Socinianiſm* ridicules the Chriſtian Religion, makes it a very mean and contemptible Inſtitution.

He tells us, That 'The Fundamental *Myſtery* of the Chriſtian Religion is the ſtupendious Love of God in giving his own Son, 'his only-beloved Son, for the Redemption 'of Mankind. But how comes this Love of God to be called a Myſtery ſtill? It was a Myſtery, or *Secret*, before the Revelation of the Goſpel; but ſince it was revealed, it ceaſes to be a Myſtery or Secret: unleſs a Secret diſcovered be a Secret ſtill.

'This, says he, our Saviour lays great 'stress on; That *God so loved the World, that* 'he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever 'believeth in him should not perish, but have ever-'lasting Life. By this, one would have 'thought, that Christ had been the Son, the 'only begotten Son of God, before God gave 'him. Now this is a very ambiguous way of expressing himself; for he professes to believe that Christ was the Son of God, nay *the only begotten Son, before* he gave him; but he differs from Us and from Common Sense in this; that by *the Son of God*, he means God himself; and by *before*, he means from all Eternity. This is a very hard Language; for who can fancy, that *the Son of God* should be *God himself*; and that *before*, should signify Eternity? Yet this is the Sense he puts upon it, when he says; 'If *Socinianism* be true, 'God did not give any Son he had *before*; but 'made an excellent Man, whom he was 'pleased to call his only begotten Son. When our Saviour says, *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, &c.* I desire our Author to tell me, what is meant by the Word *God*, Whether the whole Trinity, or the Father only? If the whole Trinity, the Sense will come to this; The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost so loved the World, that they gave their only begotten Son. Which is false; for in the *Trinitarian* Hypothesis, the Son is not the Son of the Second or Third Persons in the Trinity. If by God be meant the Father only; How comes the Father to ingross here the Title of God, to the Exclusion of the Son and the Holy Ghost? How is he only said, to *love the World*; for the Son and Holy Ghost love it as well as the Father? Thus they are not the *Socinians*, but the *Trinitarians* that ridicule the Christian Religion, by putting on it an absurd and unnatural Sense.

'But, says he, God's Love in giving his 'only-begotten Son for our Redemption, 'which our Saviour fixes on as the great De-'monstration of God's Love, is not so won-'derful; if this giving his Son signifies no 'more, than making a Man on purpose to be 'our Saviour. What then? Does it follow from thence, that the *Socinian* Doctrine ridicules the Christian Religion? It only follows, that the *Socinian* Doctrine makes the Love of God less wonderful than the *Trinitarian*. For in it self it is a wonderful Love, that God should raise up a Saviour, to Apostate and Rebel Mankind; tho this Saviour was not God himself. But why should we call a Chimera a more wonderful Love; for the Son of God cannot be God himself, and therefore God could not shew his Love by giving such a Son. To conclude; as the Love of God in redeeming Offenders, is wonderful, be the means what they will: So his Love in giving for them his Beloved Son, tho but a Man, cannot without Impiety be denied, to be wonderful to a Miracle. The ridiculing is only on the side of our Author, not on the *Unitarian*; and I am apt to think, that if I were not an *Unitarian* already, his Book (made up of bold Charges, inconsequent Reasonings, and arrogant Definings of what he understands not) would make me one.

'In the next place, says he, at *pag.* 239. 'the Apostles mightily insist on the great 'Love of Christ in dying for us, and his great 'Humility in submitting to the condition of 'Human Nature, and suffering a shameful 'and accursed Death, even the Death of the 'Cross. He cites 2 *Cor.* 8. 9. and 5. 14. and *Phil.* 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. And goes on thus; 'Supposing Christ to be but a meer Man, who 'had no being before he was born of the Vir-'gin; who knew nothing of his own coming 'into the World, or for what end he came; 'whose Undertaking was not his own volun-'tary choice, but God's appointment; Where 'is the great Love, where is the great Humi-'lity of this? The meaning of all this is, that were not Christ the Supream God, whatever he has done on our behalf, would be no great Argument of his Love, or his Humility. If *Codrus* and *Decius* devoting themselves to Death, for the Good of their respective Countries, have been accounted by all Men, great Lovers of their Countries; Shall not Christ's dying for the Eternal Salvation

of Mankind, pass for an Argument of wonderful Love? Is it nothing for Christ to lead a wandring poor and miserable Life, to expose himself to all the Injuries and Fury of Implacable Adversaries, to undergo a painful and infamous Death; and all this to make Men partakers of everlasting Life: Must all this be accounted nothing, unless the Person so doing be the Supream God? *How did he become Poor*, says he, *who was never Rich?* But I ask him, How the Supream God can *become Poor*; How God can *make himself of no Reputation*, or *humble himself and become obedient unto Death*; all which things he imputeth to a Person who is God? I would know, How it comes that Christ's Love and Humility is described by such Characters, as can only be applied to a Man; if we must not be allowed to believe, that the Love of *Christ-Man* was wonderful? He insists much on 2 *Cor.* 8. 9. where our Translation says, Christ *became Poor*. But he might know, that the Greek πτωχευσεν does not signify *to become Poor*, but *to be Poor*; and so *Castalio* renders it. So the Sense of that place is this; 'Tho Christ 'was Rich and Glorious, by reason of the 'Authority and Power conferred on him: 'yet he was willing to lead a poor Life, that 'by his Poverty (as by one means) we 'might obtain Eternal Riches and Glory.

The Historian explains *being in the Form of God* at *Phil.* 1. 6. by *being made Like to God*, by a Communication to him of Divine and Miraculous Power over Diseases, Devils, the Grave, the Winds, the Seas, *&c.* To this our Author replies; 'This dwindles *the Form* 'of God into just nothing; for according to 'them, he had no power to do this, but 'God did it at his Word, as he did for o-'ther Prophets. And therefore this is no '*Form of God*, no likeness at all: For Christ 'did not work Miracles as God does, by an 'inherent Power; but God wrought Mira-'cles for him. Christ indeed could not work Miracles by an inherent or proper Power of his own, since he was not God; but to conclude that therefore there was no form or likeness of God at all in him, is a very bad Consequence. When we say, that Christ was in the form or likeness of God; we exclude thereby an equality with God, and we mean only, that he was in a manner like God. This may be explained by a Comparison. It may be said, that a Vice-Roy is like a King; but this does not signify, that he is the King himself, or is equal to the King; but only, that by reason of the Power and Authority conferred on him, he is in a manner like the King: So that thô he does not act by a Power of his own, yet he may be truly said to act like a King. To conclude from hence, that this dwindles the likeness of the Vice-Roy with the King, into just nothing, would be meer Impertinence: for then a Porter would be as like a King as the Vice-Roy himself; which no Man in his Senses will affirm. When therefore Christ, by the Power bestowed upon him, cast out Devils, cured all sorts of Diseases, raised the Dead, commanded the Winds and the Seas; He was indeed in the likeness of God, and it was a great Humility in him, that he was so far from making an Ostentation of his Glory and Greatness, that he became like a Servant, humbled himself, and underwent all sorts of Sufferings, even the Death of the Cross.

'But, says the Author, *pag.* 241. How did 'he *take this Form* upon him, which signi-'fies his own free and voluntary Choice; 'when he did not take it, but was made 'so! What? when the Apostle says, that Christ *took upon him the Form of a Servant*; must we say, that he did not? Is it not a plain Contradiction to the Apostle? He adds; 'And what Humility was this, for a meer 'Man to be a Minister and Servant of God; 'and so great a Minister as to be in the Form 'of God, that is (as he says) to be glorious 'for Miracles, and admired as the great 'Power of God: especially, when he was 'to be exalted unto Heaven for it, and ad-'vanced above all Principalities and Powers? 'This is such Humility, as would have been '*Pride and Ambition* in the most glorious An-'gel. Shall we not call Humility what St. *Paul* calls so? He tells us, that the same who

has been advanced above all the Orders of Angels, humbled himself. All the Glory that Christ has been crowned with, doth not hinder the Apostle from praising and extolling his Humility. Because Christ's Sufferings have been remunerated with a transcendent Glory; must they not be accounted Humility, but *Pride?* On the contrary, the more that he who humbles himself is great and glorious, the greater is his Humility. Seeing therefore Christ had received from God more Glory than ever any Man had, it follows, that his Humility was the most stupendious and unparallel'd that ever was. But according to our Author's way of reasoning, there is no such thing as Christian Humility. For every Christian who humbles himself, endeavours thereby to fit himself for the Kingdom of Heaven: but all our best Actions are not worthy to be compared with that *Glory which shall be revealed* in us; and therefore will our Author say, Humility is but a Chimera, because he who is said to humble himself, expects to get by the means an Eternal Glory. Indeed if the most bitter Sufferings of Christ, are not to be accounted Humility, because they were to be rewarded with a more excellent Glory: I cannot see, how any Christians may be said to be humble; for they expect a glorious and transcendent Reward.

Pag. 242. 'After Christ was come into 'the World, there was no place (saith our 'Author) for his Choice and Election; he 'could not shew either his Love or his Hu'mility, in choosing Poverty or Death: 'and therefore if it was matter of his free 'Choice, and a Demonstration of his great 'Humility and Love, as the Apostle says it 'was; he must and did choose it before he 'came into the World. But all this is contrary to the place of the Apostle, wherein he speaks only of what Christ has done since he came into the World, and does not so much as mention what he had done before. Which has forced several Trinitarian Interpreters to acknowledg, that this Text does not relate to the Incarnation. I desire our Author to tell me the meaning of these words, *Who being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God.* For if to be *in the Form of God*, signifies, *to be the true God*; then the sense will be this; 'Christ being the 'true God, thought it not Robbery to be e'qual with the true God. Which is just as if one should say, *Leopold* who is Emperour does not think it Robbery to be equal with the Emperour. Is it possible, Men should put such a trifling sense on the words of an Apostle? Besides, how can it be said here, that *the Supream God made himself of no Reputation?* In a word, of all the things spoken of Christ in this place, not one of them can be applied to the Supream God: which plainly shews, that the Man Christ Jesus only did humble himself; and that this Humility is so far from proving that Christ is God, that it demonstrates, he was only a Man.

He goes on; 'The Faith and Worship of 'Christ, is the distinguishing Character of 'the Christian Religion. That the Faith of Christ is the distinguishing Character of the Christian Religion, I grant; but I deny, that the Worship of Christ is so too. I suppose, by the Worship of Christ, he means only the Worship of *Christ's Divine Nature*; for he tells us in the following words, that both the Natural and Mosaical Religion *condemn the Worship of any Creature*; therefore Christ's Humane Nature being a Creature, ought not to be worshipped. Of the Worship paid to Christ, I have said enough already; but because our Author gives occasion for it, by repeating his Charge of Idolatry, I will consider what he has offered, in its proper place. Only here I shall mind him; that the Compilers of the Apostles Creed have made no mention of the Worship of Christ, but only of Faith in him.

At *pag.* 245. He goes on to prove, that the Socinian Doctrine ridicules the Christian Religion; 'Because it does not ascribe to Christ 'such Knowledg as is proper to the Supream 'God. His first Proof, is *John* 2. 25. *He knew what was in Man.* To which the Historian had before answered thus; 'The Knowledg 'which the Lord Christ had, or now in his

'State

' State of Exaltation hath, of the Secrets of ' Mens Hearts, is the pure Gift of, and Re- ' velation from God; and the *Divine Word* ' abiding on him. Rev. 1. 1. *The Revelation* ' *of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew* ' *unto his Servants.* Our Author would elude the ſtrength of this Anſwer, thus; ' This ' (ſaith he) is a plain abuſe of the Text and ' the Reaſon of it. *He knew what was in* ' *Man*, is the Reaſon aſſigned why he needed ' not external Information, or Teſtimony ' of Man. *He needed not that any ſhould teſtify of* ' *Man*, for *αὐτὸς*, he himſelf *knew what was* ' *in Man*, and knew all Men. Which ac- ' cording to the propriety of Words, ſigni- ' fies an inherent Perſonal Knowledg; in op- ' poſition to any external Manifeſtation, and ' therefore to Revelation it ſelf. For he al- ' ways knew all Men, which cannot be done ' by Revelation; which is particular and oc- ' caſional. Here one may plainly ſee, what ſtrange ſhifts Men are put to, when they op- poſe Truth. Who denies that thoſe Words, *He knew what was in Man*, ſignify inherent Perſonal Knowledg? Can any Man know any thing but by his inherent Perſonal Knowledg? He that knows, knows *with his own Mind*, and therefore has an Inherent and Perſonal Know- ledg. But does it follow from thence, that ſuch a Knowledg is not from Revelation? I hope it may be ſaid of a Man inlightned by Revelation, that *he knows*, as well as of any other? And yet tho ſuch a Man be inſpired, he has an inherent Perſonal Knowledg; for *his own Mind* knows *inwardly* what he did not know before. But *αὐτὸς*, ſays our Author, *he himſelf* knew; which according to the Pro- priety of Words, ſignifies an inherent Per- ſonal Knowledg *in oppoſition to Revelation.* No ſurely. For then the Prophet *Eliſha* was God, for he knew what the King of *Syria* ſpake in his Bed-chamber, 2 *Kings* 6. 12. For *αὐτὸς*, *he himſelf* knew what the King of *Syria* ſpake: yet this was certainly by Revelation. If our Author ſhould reply, that it is well known that *Eliſha* was but a Prophet, and could know no ſuch thing but by Inſpiration or Re- velation. I anſwer, It is likewiſe well known, that Chriſt knew not all things, and particular- ly not the Day of Judgment, *Mark* 13. 32. therefore he could not be God, for God knows all things. Beſides, the Scripture aſſures us, that God gave to Chriſt his Revelation, *Rev.* 1. 1. which proves that all his extraordinary Knowledg was derived from God. But *he always knew all Men*, ſaith the Author, *which cannot be done by Revelation; which is par- ticular and occaſional.* Why not? God's Re- velation may be perpetual, if he pleaſes. There is no Contradiction or Impoſſibility in it. But how has he perverted the firſt Verſe of St. *John's Revelations? The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt which God gave to him, to ſhew unto his Servants things, which muſt ſhortly come to paſs.* ' This, ſays he, doth not ſignify that this was ' a Revelation made to Jeſus Chriſt, but that ' Revelation which Chriſt made; for tho ' God is ſaid to give to him, it is *to ſhew unto* ' *his Servants*; that is, by appointment of ' God, Chriſt ſhewed this Revelation unto ' *John.* Alas, if our Author was not able to anſwer this place, he ſhould not have ſtudi- ed to elude it. If Chriſt made this Revelati- on, becauſe he is God, how is it ſaid *to be gi- ven to him*, which can in no ſenſe agree to him who is true God? *He received it*, ſays our Au- thor, *to ſhew unto his Servants.* But of whom can the true God receive, either Knowledg, or Authority to diſpenſe it? But here are two Arguments againſt our Author's Doctrine: 1. That God gave to Chriſt a Revelation. But he that is God can need no Revelation; becauſe himſelf knoweth all things. 2. That He is appointed to ſhew this Revelation to o- thers. Which no more can agree to one who is God, than Revelation does.

He concludes; that ' He deſires a Media- ' tor, who knows more, and in a more per- ' fect manner. But I think, 'tis fit we ſhould be contented with ſuch a Mediator, as God was pleaſed to give us.

IV. His laſt Charge is; that ' Socinianiſm ' juſtifies, at leaſt excuſes, both Pagan and ' Popiſh Idolatries; at leaſt as it is taught ' by thoſe Men, who allow of the Worſhip ' of Chriſt; which it is certain too, the ' Chriſtian Religion teaches.

In

In anſwer hereto; I will, 1. Shew in what conſiſts the Worſhip or Honour due to Chriſt. 2. Compare this Worſhip, with the Worſhip which Pagans exhibited to their falſe Gods, and Papiſts to their Saints.

1. I obſerve that in the Unitarian Hypotheſis, the Worſhip or Honour due to Chriſt, is not a ſupream Worſhip; ſuch as we ought to pay to God. Chriſt being a Creature, can never be worſhipped as God is. Thô he be never ſo great and glorious, a ſupream Worſhip is proper only to Almighty God, and can never be beſtowed on any Creature. 2. As it cannot be denied, that there are divers Orders of Creatures; ſo the Honour paid to them, ought to be proportionable to their Greatneſs and Dignity. Thus, in a Kingdom thoſe, who by reaſon of their Dignity, are above the common ſort of Men, deſerve a greater Reſpect and Honour than others; and the King, who is above them all, has an Honour paid to him which is incommunicable to the reſt of his Subjects. By the ſame reaſon Angels, who are more excellent than Men, are worthy of greater Honour. But Chriſt, who has been exalted above both Men and Angels, ſince he is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, hath a proper Worſhip due to him, which can never be given either to Angels or Men. He is God's Beloved Son *by way of Excellence*, all Power is given to him in Heaven and Earth, he is at the Right-hand of God, having all things put under his Feet; he deſerves therefore an Honour, ſo much greater than theirs, as he is greater. Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11. *God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name; that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth; and that every Tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* The Apoſtle does not ſay, that every Knee ought to bow at the Name of Jeſus, becauſe he is the Supream God; but becauſe God has exalted him above Men and Angels; becauſe he has *obtained* (of God) a Name above every Name, the moſt eminent and glorious Dignity that ever was. This is the true ground of the Honour which is due to Chriſt. This St. *Paul* teaches; and this the Unitarians profeſs to believe, and perform. 3. When we worſhip Chriſt, it is *to the Glory of God the Father*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks. The Honour we pay to Chriſt, is terminated in God: we worſhip him *as God's Ambaſſador and Image*. As he who believes in him, believes in God alſo; ſo he who honours him, honours God alſo.

2. Let us compare the Worſhip of Chriſt (the Reader will remember, we mean not thereby a Supream Worſhip) with the Worſhip of Falſe Gods among *Pagans*, and of Saints among Papiſts. *Pagans* were guilty of Idolatry; becauſe, Firſt they had no Divine Command for ſuch Worſhip: but even our Author confeſſes, there is ſuch a Command for the Worſhip of Chriſt. To worſhip Creatures without the Warrant of God, is Uſurpation on, and Contempt of God. Secondly, They worſhipped and ſerved Creatures *more than the Creator*, as St. *Paul* ſays. They ſet up an infinite number of Gods, who had been meer Men; and aſcribed to them ſuch Power as did not belong to them, and ſuch Worſhip as was infinitely above them. They offered Sacrifices to them, conſecrated Temples to their Honour, prayed to them; in a word, they paid to them ſuch Worſhip, as was *terminated in them*, and ſo made True Gods of Men. But it is not ſo with the Worſhip of Chriſt. We aſcribe to him no other Power, but what we know from the Scriptures God has beſtowed on him; and no other Honour but what is proportionable to that Power, to the Dignity of his Perſon, and what God himſelf commands us to pay him. This may be applied to the Papiſts. Let them ſhow us any Text of Scripture, which obliges us to worſhip St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, St. *Francis*. Were they content to keep within the bounds of Reſpect and Honour, due to glorified Saints, they ſhould be guilty of no Fault. But to pray to them, as many do, as Mediators both of Interceſſion *and Merit*, to dedicate Churches to them, to kneel down before their Images and to their Images,

Images, nay to their vileſt Relicks; this approaches too near to Idolatry. Our Author therefore miſtakes, when he ſays; 'The 'greateſt hurt (*on the Unitarian Hypotheſis*) 'ſeems to be, that they (*Pagans and Papiſts*) 'loſe their Labour, but according to theſe 'Principles they do no Injury to God. What then? Is it all one, to worſhip Chriſt by God's Appointment, and to worſhip Falſe Gods and (Apocryphal) Saints, without any Warrant from God? Is it all one, to pay to Chriſt ſuch Honour as neither exceeds his Power, nor is greater than his Dignity, and honour Falſe Gods and Saints, in ſuch manner as exceeds both their Power and Merit? That, is Obedience to God's Will; the Other, deteſtable Uſurpation and Rebellion. I conclude therefore, that the *Unitarians* by the Worſhip they pay to Chriſt, cannot be ſaid to juſtify or excuſe *Pagans* or *Papiſts*. Which if it had not been an invidious Charge, is ſo apparently Falſe, that it would not have deſerved any notice.

And thus I have done with that part of the Doctor's Book, which I undertook to anſwer. It may be, the Hiſtorian himſelf might, upon ſome Texts, and to ſome of our Author's Objections, have either explained or defended himſelf, otherways than is here done: and that we may, it ſeems, ſhortly ſee; unleſs Dr. *Sherlock thinks fit to own, that he deſires it not*. In the mean time, it may be the Hiſtorian is ſatisfied; that in theſe Papers, I have done wrong neither to him, nor to the Inviolable Truth of God. God be pleaſed to Inſpire Chriſtians, with the Spirit that leads into all Truth; and with that Infallible *Note of true Diſciples, to love one another*, John 13. 35.

Now to him that is of Power, to eſtabliſh us according to his Goſpel, and the preaching of Jeſus Chriſt; to God only wiſe, be Glory through Jeſus Chriſt for ever. Amen.

FINIS.